

WHY PAKISTAN

by

BASHIR AHMAD DAR, M. A.

Author of

A Study in Iqbal's Philosophy

NEW ERA PUBLICATIONS
LAHORE - INDIA

1916

COPYRIGHT

*Printed by M. Morel et D^{ns} at the Trades Press of
Press Labrie, and Published by M. Morel et D^{ns},
Labrie.*

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Scheme of Hindu Raj	16
III.	Nationalism or Imperialism	50
IV.	Democracy or Fascism	79
V.	Lesson of History	91
VI.	History Repeats itself in India	105
VII.	Congress Establishes an Inquisition	115
VIII.	Farce of Fundamental Rights	139
IX.	Why Pakistan ?	149

PREFACE

This book needs no apology. It is intended to answer an important question too often asked by the unsophisticated people of India—Why Pakistan? It is meant to provide the political and social background of the events which led the Muslim Nation of India to demand separate sovereign states for themselves.

It analyses, most critically, yet impartially, the ideals for which the Hindu Congress stands today—as an embodiment of Brahmanic traditions of social inequality, political blackmailing, economic strangulation and religious persecution of the common people of India.

Lastly it gives an ideological content to the League's demand of Pakistan—an experimental laboratory from where people can learn ways of real peace, prosperity and eternal happiness.

I am glad to acknowledge my indebtedness to Maulana Mawloodi's books which helped me in several respects.

H. A. DAR

TO
THE NOBLE MEMORY
OF
SULTAN TIPPU, S. AHMAD BRELVI
AND
SHAH ISMAIL SHAHID
THE THREE GREAT MARTYRS
WHO LAID DOWN THEIR LIVES
IN
THE CAUSE OF ISLAM
AND
MUSLIM NATION OF INDIA

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Since March 1940, when the Muslim League decided in favour of Pakistan as the goal of the Indian Muslims much has been spoken and written by non-Muslims for and against it but nobody has so far tried to probe beneath and realise the true significance of this ideal. They have failed to bring into the matter a sympathetic attitude towards our aspirations and invariably judged our case from the point of view of their own national interests. Dr. Ambedkar in his otherwise scientific work on Pakistan adopts a perfectly hostile attitude towards us as a community and spares no pains in depicting us as the worst lot of people, morally as well as politically. He characterises the Muslims as political gangsters who should be driven back to the North of India so that the Hindus may be able to live peacefully in Hindustan un-contaminated by their evil influences. We do not wish to enter the field against the Hon'ble Doctor who, quite unjustly repudiated by the caste Hindus, has developed an offensive technique of indulging in most abusive language against

his opponents. His support of Pakistan, however, is scientific and correct and is mainly derived from his analysis of the history of Hindu-Muslim relationship in India. He says, "What stands between the Hindus and Muslims is not a mere difference; it is an antagonism as distinguished from mere difference. This difference is not to be attributed to material causes. It is spiritual in character. It is formed by causes that take origins in historical, religious, cultural and social antipathy of which political antipathy is only a reflection."¹ Thus Dr. Ambedkar has succeeded in laying his finger on the real disease in our body-politic. The social and economic boycott of Muslims which has been carried on by the caste Hindus is not so much the real cause of estrangement: it is a mere outward manifestation of inconsistency of fundamental ideological outlooks of the two people.

To argue for Pakistan on the basis of superficial differences between the two communities would be to kick a weaker horse. There had been riots, mutual hatred, recriminations on a vast scale but they can be adjusted given a proper healthy atmosphere. It is rather the existence of two mutually exclusive and contradictory ideologies as represented by Islam and Hinduism that alone can justify our case.

¹ *Speeches on Pakistan*, p. 211

to a different nationality and hence Pakistan. If it can be proved that Hindus and Muslims had been living most cordially and sympathetically side by side for centuries without ever coming into conflict, then shall we cease to assert that Muslims are a nation in themselves quite apart from Hindus or, for the matter of that, from other people? Decidedly not. It is not the existence of these differences, social or economic, between these two great people of India that can be made the basis of our claim. As a matter of fact, the only criterion by which we can justify our present stand in India is the peculiar nature of our religion which demands that those who believe it and follow Islam are a nation in themselves whether they have any political or social differences with other people like Hindus or whether they have no such differences as in the case of Arab Christians of the Middle East. It was in reality to counteract these very arguments, based on a superficial reading of the situation, in favour of Pakistan that some Hindu writers have begun to delve deep into the pages of forgotten history books to prove that Muslims were not intolerant in the past. Those who once took great delight in dwelling on the brutality and inhuman attitude of Mahmud of Ghazni and Aurangzeb, to take only a few instances, have changed their attitude and are now

willing to pay a tribute to their considerateness towards the Hindus. Those very people who, only a few years back, extolled Sevaji as the pioneer and father of Hindu political regeneration and who was alleged to represent in his person Hindu reaction against alien Muslim rule of tyranny, have, by a strange logic, come to notice praiseworthy qualities of Aurangzeb. A Hindu writer on Pakistan says, "The earliest forbears of the Muslims of India came to this country a little over a thousand years ago. Since that long period of time they have been living in this land, sharing its joys and vicissitudes, with their fellow countrymen of other faiths. It is true that they came as conquerors but they stayed as sons of India.. During the palmy days of their sovereignty they did not forget their obligations to the people of the land. Their co-operation with the Hindus in the fields of diplomacy and administration was unrestricted and complete. Even the celebrated Mahmud of Ghazni was not such a Hindu hater as he is commonly depicted in history." In the preface the author claims that the differences between the Hindu and Muslim civilizations are not so fundamental as to justify the segregation of the two from the others. But in spite of his attempt to look a path to Islam I think I have succeeded in doing it.

his all but too natural a hatred for the alien Muslims which pervades every part of his thesis. He still retains his prejudice against Aurangzeb whom he blames for reversing the policy of Akbar and his successors and who for that reason became the last Moghul.¹ But the two authors of *The Communal Triangle in India* go still further. They are willing to pay their homage to Aurangzeb as well by laboriously unearthing a long forgotten fact (!) that he had in his employment a large number of Hindu officers, some of whom he elevated to the rank of Governors of provinces. They argue that "to suggest that for a thousand years Hindus and Muslims lived together, not peacefully, but like Plato's team of horses one of which flies to the sun while the other draws towards the earth, is not only un-historical but absurd, because that is not the way in which men live together or live creatively."²

But, as a matter of fact, this re-interpretation of history does not prove their case against Pakistan, just as the mere enumeration of our differences cannot prove our case in its favour. We admit that throughout the centuries Muslims and Hindus lived peacefully on the same soil developing along their respective cultural patterns which at several places met most fruitfully and helped to foster a sort of

¹ Kulkarni, V. B., Op. cit., p. 14.

² P. 18.

united spirit. But with the advent of the British the situation changed. Under the patronage of the rulers, Hindus succeeded in stealing a march over the Muslims in all the spheres of life, educationally, economically and socially. Having no cut and dried polity—a social structure regulated by a legal system and animated by a specific ethical ideal—they accepted the political theories of the West *in toto* just as they had done during the Muslim rule. Gradually they developed an extreme form of aggressive nationalism which was unfortunately directed not against the alien rulers but against the Muslims. It was this spirit of antagonism displayed by the Hindus which more than anything else prompted early Muslim thinkers like the late Sir Sayyid Ahmad to adopt a defensive and negative attitude towards their political aspirations as embodied in the Congress. Thus, historically speaking, the real rock on which all our attempts of resolving the so-called communal problem have foundered is not religious at all but political. Religious differences there were from the very beginning and still we managed to live peacefully for a thousand years on the same soil, side by side. But when Hindus became politically conscious of their superiority in quality as well as in quantity and were determined to exterminate us, the situation changed overnight. The problem ceased to

be of religious toleration but assumed the form of co-existence of two mutually exclusive nationalities based on different ideologies.

Religiously speaking, Muslims of India had never been very keen. With the exception of a very few individual cases, the majority of people who came to India either as settlers or colonists or conquerors can hardly claim to be the real torch-bearers of pure Islamic ideals. Their motive was personal aggrandisement and in their private as well as political life they never cared to follow the religious law. They totally lacked the missionary zeal which characterised, for instance, the earliest expedition to Sind connected with the name of Muhammad b. Qasim. Similarly most of the mystics that appeared in India, barring, of course, certain famous sufis of early times, hardly represented in their life the true spirit of Islam. They adopted certain practices which can, by no stretch of imagination, be called Islamic. Had this process ⁵ went on unhindered, the world would have witnessed the greatest transformation of the ⁹¹ modern period. The whole body of Muslims of India would have merged themselves, though gradually, into the Hindus and out of this amalgamation a new nation would have evolved. But the emergence of the British power in this sub-continent which struck a death-blow to the tottering political

power of the Muslims, coupled with the appearance of national consciousness in the Hindus aimed at their total extermination, brought them to their senses and they began to discover the real cause of their down-fall. Lying low at the feet of a powerful enemy who had humbled them in the battlefield and surrounded by a people who till then had been their subjects but who now had acquired a new sense of their existence, they became conscious of their weak position and began to strive hard to regain their lost ground. They naturally adopted a defensive and apologetic outlook. But in the life of societies negative attitude cannot work long. If they were to stand on their legs again and lead an honourable life once more they had to adopt some positive attitude towards life. For years and years we were a mere crowd of people bereft of everything, with no ideal and no organisation worth the name. We were tossing over the political currents of this country, sometimes carried to the left and at other times driven to the west, with no definite goal in sight. But suddenly a light appears. We cease to be a medley conglomeration of aimless individuals. We acquire an ideal worth fighting for. We are no longer straying on the ocean but are ready to plough our own furrow along our destined end. As Iqbal has so aptly said, at critical moments in our history it is Islam that has saved

Muslims and not *vice versa*. We have realised that we are a nation in ourselves not because we are different in almost every respect from the Hindus but because we are Muslims: our allegiance to Islam is an ideal, a binding force, an inspiration and destiny all combined. We have been saved from destruction as a nation through Islam. Thus the problem of Pakistan is not the problem of adjustment and resolution of differences between Hindus and Muslims but the realisation of the ideal which Islam places before us. The differences there were and there will be and we can find ways and means whereby the present-day conflicts can be totally eliminated but that has nothing to do with our ideal of Pakistan. It is the embodiment of our aspirations, the new Magna Carta of freedom, of future peace, prosperity, and economic emancipation of humanity which can only be attained through Islam.

In order to appreciate the exact position of this ideal, we must distinguish the nature of Muslim nationalism as embodied in the ideal of Pakistan from nationalism of other peoples. Islamic nationalism is nourished neither on a doctrine of race superiority nor on the militant theory of a *Fatherland Uber Alles*; it is ideological from beginning to end. Racial, territorial or class outlook divides mankind into warring camps bent upon the destruction of one another while

ideological outlook is thoroughly human and cuts across races, territories and classes and builds upon the 'moral structure of righteousness which alone is the guarantee of future peace and welfare of mankind as a whole. Much has been and is being said against religion as an organised force in our life but whether the critics of religion are western or eastern, none has ever tried to look at it in the right perspective. Religion in the eyes of Christian or Hindu critics is always without exception identified with Christianity or Hinduism and never Islam and there is a world of difference between the two. To a Christian or a Hindu, religion is only a mode of worship and so a private affair, a minor addendum to human life which is to be kept at an arm's length. It is confined to our relationship with a hypothetical god or gods which does not influence us in determining our moral and intellectual outlook, which does not give us any dependable criteria of judgment nor any code of moral laws whereby to regulate the whole complexity of our life. As such the pattern of society that evolves under the influence of such a static and reactionary religion is not a whit better than the pattern of society that evolves under the influence of a purely materialistic, secular or anti-religious outlook. Rationalism in philosophy, materialism in general outlook, utilitarianism in morals characterise both.

Their form of politics is machiavellism, their economic is 'capitalistic' exploitation and their sociological outlook is complete individual freedom amounting to libertinism based on the policy of might is right. It was therefore all but natural that Christian Europe should look not to Christ for inspiration but to the pagan Greek culture and Hindu India should seek consolation in accepting *in toto* the political theories of the materialistic West.

But there is a dynamic conception of religion which is progressive and revolutionary in its nature. It believes in the psychological unity of man and his harmonious relation with the universe in which he lives, moves and has his being. It is not a minor addendum of our life, but life itself, its inner-most spirit and motive force, a touch-stone of truth and error, demarcating the path of righteousness at every step from the path of evil. It deals not only with the relation of man to his Creator, it equally determines our relation to other human beings and to the universe of nature. Its aim and object is to impress upon our mind that the different spheres of our multifarious activities are not so many different water-tight compartments but a unified and organic whole in which each part has its unique place and none of which can be removed from its context without destroying the harmonious evolution of

particular mode of behaviour in accordance with that attitude and outlook. It is religion, culture and civilisation all combined into one. This unity, again, affords us a lofty moral ideal which determines the value of each and everything from the lowest to the highest. It regulates the life of an individual as much as the life of a society. It is a psychological outlook on life which brings in its purview the most trivial and the most sublime problems of our existence here and thus helps in the harmonious growth of individuals and societies. From the mosque to the market and the battlefield, from the mode of worship to the mode of using the radio and the airplane, from the ordinary problem of health and sanitation to the most important problems of sociology, economics, politics and international relations, from the elementary education of the child to the observation of nature and research of natural laws, in short, all the multifarious and multiform activities of life are brought under certain regulative principles which have their basis on our loyalty to God and since God is the ultimate spiritual basis of all life, loyalty to God virtually amounts to man's loyalty to his own ideal nature. Thus a dynamic religion like Islam alone can bring eternal peace and harmony to the world torn asunder by conflicting loyalties. The world is in need of it and we

are the proud inheritors of this message of hope. But before the world can realize the intrinsic value of this message it is necessary that we should be able to show to the people the practical efficiency of this ideal. Pakistan is to be the future haven of peace from which the miserable world would learn the ways of eternal happiness and harmony.

CHAPTER TWO

Scheme of Hindu Raj

In order to appreciate the underlying spirit of Hindu nationalism as embodied in the Congress, we must understand what the word 'Hindu' implies. It does not indicate any body of people who follow a particular religion or faith. Hinduism is not a religion at all in the sense in which Christianity or Islam is. All the hundreds of tribes and castes of India who are not Muslims or Christians are called Hindus and the aggregate of their traditions, beliefs, customs and institutions is called Hinduism, though they may be mutually irreconcilable. "Though the Hindus are separated from other religious communities, it should not be imagined that they are united by a bond of a common system of doctrines. There is in fact no system of doctrines, no teacher, or school of teaching, no single god that is accepted by all the Hindus. Again, no amount of deviation from the established doctrines or disregard of any book or even of some customs, would cause a person to fall from Hinduism, that is, become liable to exclusion from the Hindu community."

But with all this diversity of races, beliefs and customs that make up the Hindu nation of India, there is one element at least which strikes all Non-Hindus, *viz.*, their caste division. They are divided into about three thousand castes and much larger number of sub-castes, every one of which forms an exclusive group consisting of persons born of members of the group. We do not wish to enter into any lengthy controversy over the origin or the present position of the caste-system in India. We have mentioned this fact because the presence of this system among the Hindus has been responsible, to a great extent, for the present estrangement among Hindus and Muslims of India and much of the long drawn-out controversies connected with the solution of the so-called communal problem might not have arisen in its absence. To orthodox Hindus, Muslims and Christians are no more than alien and untouchables. The Indian Christian community is now willing to co-operate with the Hindus for the emancipation of the country. At present it enjoys the patronage of the Christian Government and therefore does not fully realise the sting of social boycott of the Hindus just as the Muslims never felt it so long as they had the consolation of official patronage during Muslim rule. But as soon as the British hand over the substance of power to the Congress, which is dominated by the votaries

of the old Brahman imperialism, the fate of the Indian Christians would be the same as that of the Muslims. They must either willingly merge themselves into the heterogeneous mixture of races and creeds called Hinduism and thus add to the already staggering number of the untouchables or leave the country bag and baggage or, if they are determined to keep their religion and culture alive in this land of their birth, they will have to face the worst form of Inquisition at the hands of these champions of democracy and equality! Ch. Afzal Haque says: "Musalmans of the Aryan race, Musalmans of the sufi cult, Musalmans of the High Houses, Musalmans of good education, were treated alike as untouchable of the Hindu society. You may be a pucca nationalist and a four-square Gandhiite, yet you will be treated as an untouchable as soon as you announce to a Hindu that you are a Musalman. However justified the Hindus feel and however innocent they plead in their treatment of the Musalmans, in justice they cannot blame the latter if they cultivate an ill-feeling towards them."¹ We do not wish to dilate upon the advantages or disadvantages of the caste system² or claim that the presence of this system among Hindus is denial of the ideals of democracy, equality or freedom or to

¹ *Editorial of the Times of India*, p. 47

² See *Times*, Jan. 18, 1914, p. 7 for a full account of the system

refer to the treatment of the untouchables by Hindus;¹ for none of these directly bears on the subject before us. What we want to emphasise is that this particularly exclusive nature of the socio-religious system of the Hindus was bound to affect the direction and flow of the current of nationalism that manifested itself in the latter part of the last century.

All the alien elements that came to India after Aryan invasion were gradually absorbed into its body-politic but Muslims alone, in spite of a long contact of a thousand years, had maintained their separate existence and so they were the first target of attack when Hindus became politically conscious. It was the pernicious influence of rigorous caste-system which could not tolerate the presence of a group of people that was not willing to be brought under one of its numerous castes and sub-castes. What happened later was therefore all but natural and if at present Independence of India is as far from our grasp or better, sight as it was 50 or 60 years back when the Congress started its career, the explanation lies only in the tragic presence of this system in the Hindu society that produces in them an aggressive form of exclusiveness which is thoroughly militant in its attitude towards the Muslims.

¹ For this, see Dr. Ambedkar's: *Gandhi and the Emancipation of the Untouchables* and Swami Dharma Theerthaji: *Menace of Hind Imperialism*.

The whole political advancement of the country has been unfortunately retarded by the presence of conflict among the various peoples of India and everybody realises that without the communal settlement independence cannot be possible. But is this settlement, and therefore political advancement, possible, so long as the nature of Hindu society remains as it is?

During the latter half of the last century when Hindu nationalism was becoming more and more vocal, some eminent reformists like Ranade began to concentrate their whole energies on the reconstruction of Hindu society on democratic lines and on eradicating the evil of caste-system. But the politicians of the day dis-credited him and his mission. They raised a great hue and cry and made his work impossible. Mr. Tilak, a Brahman of the South, was the foremost politician who declared a war against him, fearing an encroachment on the hereditary rights of his class sanctified by Manu. He started his crusade against Ranade's social reform movement by advocating that political reform was to have precedence over social reform. How alike the technique of hypocrisy is! The same meaningless slogan, after 60 years of struggle, is being dinned into our ears by Mr. Nehru and other orthodox imperialists, in a different context, of course, that political freedom is to have

precedence over communal settlement. Ranade retorted with the thrusting logic of a sincere reformist. He said : " You cannot be liberal by halves. You cannot be liberal in politics and conservative in religion. The heart and the head must go together. You cannot cultivate your intellect, enrich your mind, enlarge the sphere of your political rights and privileges, and at the same time keep your hearts closed and cramped. It is an idle dream to expect men to remain enchained and ensnaked in their own superstitions and social evils, while they are struggling hard to win rights and privileges from their rulers. Before long these vain dreamers will find their dreams lost."¹ Mr. Ranade did not live to see his prophecy of disillusionment and frustration fulfilled to the very letter. The Congress stood for *status quo* in social reform and though demanding democratic rights from the British was determined to deny it to the common masses of India and defended this apathy towards the rights of the people by a resort to the hollow maxim of unity of front against the foreigners. The president elect of the Congress in his message to the Social Conference of 1895 wrote thus : " The *raison d' être* for excluding social questions from our deliberations is that if we were to take up such questions, it may lead to serious differences ultimately culminating in

¹ Dr. Ambedkar: *Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah*, pp. 38-39.

a schism, and it is a matter of the first importance to prevent a split.”¹ This passage is sufficiently illuminating. It gives the whole reason at the back of the mind of the Hindu High Command for paying no attention to the problems of adjustment of relations between different castes, higher and lower, so as to evolve a homogeneous society on a true democratic basis with equal opportunity for all and finally the adjustment of the relation of a democratised Hindu society with the Muslims for the future welfare and stability of our land. They think, and rightly so, that if they were to tackle the first problem first, their dream of acquiring power would disappear, the common people would refuse to be dominated by a clique of exploiters who represent in their persons nothing but the age-long reactionary forces of Brahmanism which has nourished and grown fat on the ignorance of the trodden people. They tried to build up their lofty mansion of nationalism on the sandy foundations of opposition to the foreign ruler and with this empty clarion call they succeeded in mustering the people to their platform. It is possible to frighten the foreign master into a relaxation of his grip upon us by an exhibition of feigned unity and strength. The trick worked well for a time and the Government gave a semblance of power

¹ *Swami Dharma Terasaji*, Op. Cit., p. 322.

to the Congress. But as soon as its constructive policy manifested itself, the differences came to the forefront and the whole body-politic stood aghast and revolted. All the irreconcilable elements of Indian life which so far had remained submerged came to the surface, each demanding recognition for its separate existence. The Dravidians, the untouchables, the Sachuts and the Muslims, all began to clamour for their rights which the Congress has so far refused to accept. The serious differences and schism which the orthodox group of the Congress wanted to avoid for the sake of freedom of the country could not be dissipated by merely ignoring their reality. For fifty years these leaders succeeded by one attempt or another to keep them beneath the surface and show to the world a sort of patched-up unity of front against the foreign rulers but they were bound to appear and it is better for the future welfare of our country that they have at last raised their head to such a height that nobody can now ignore them. Struggle for political freedom must be postponed for a while and the whole energy of the nation must be directed to the problem of reform and reconstruction of society on a truly democratic basis. But, I think, it is a folly on our part if we believe for a moment that the present Congress leaders, so much intoxicated by power, will

ever listen to reason and facts of history: they refuse to learn the lesson which the history of fifty years of their hollow nationalism teaches them. A show of unity brought them power which they used not in the true democratic spirit but in strengthening the chains of slavery and in oppressing those whom Brahmanism is out to exploit.

Some Congress apologists, realising the magnitude of disaster inherent in this policy, have come out with the plea that Mr. Gandhi stands for the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity and emancipation of the untouchables. He is quoted to say, "I regard untouchability as the root-cause of our downfall and Hindu-Muslim discord." So far as the statement goes, it is the clearest expression of a fact and a true diagnosis of the disease that is eating into the very vitals of our body-politic. But when we turn to actual facts we find that Mr. Gandhi's is not a very logical position. If untouchability is the root cause of our failure in forging a really united front, why has he not cried halt to the mere political programme of the Congress and diverted all his energies towards the emancipation of the out-castes? The fact is that he wants to go on with his political programme with a greater zeal and greater strength so as to attain power and all the while appeasing the out-castes and the Muslims with empty

phrases and meaningless slogans. What he intends to do for the uplift of the untouchables, the brilliant episode of his fast-unto-death—a piece of political blackmailing—can clearly show. He stands for the caste system and is not ready to abolish it. But even if we accept that he sincerely stands for a revolutionary change in this system, we may rest assured that he cannot succeed. The institution is too sacred, too strong and too profitable for the Brahman imperialists to be allowed to be broken into pieces by the flimsy hands of Mr. Gandhi. His whole popularity with his people rests on the thoroughly conservative and reactionary character of his mission. An eminent Hindu writer, who has studied the problem sufficiently deeply, says that Mr. Gandhi, “has not been openly disowned by the Hindus because he *has refrained from directly attacking the castes*; but when it comes to real concerted action in social life in addition to putting up a fight with foreign rulers, he too will have either to denounce the evil and fight it, or else fail in the ultimate attainment of true freedom and unity for India and Hindus.”¹

The moral is clear. Unless the present

¹ Swami Dharma Theerthaji: Op. cit., p. 201

“The caste system of Hindus, according to Vedas and Shastras, is not man’s creation and the whole structure of the Hindu religion and civilization is based thereon. The matter of eradication of the caste system, therefore,... means the condemnation of all the sacred books of Hindus.” *Tribune*, Jan. 18, 1946, p. 7., Cols. 3, 4: “Social Reform and the Congress.”

social system of the Hindus remains, it is impossible for anybody in India to come to any terms with them. The caste system may be good or bad in itself, is not the problem. What we are concerned with is the spirit underlying it, the spirit of political machiavelism and economic strangulation for the sake of a superior race of Brahmans who have for full one thousand years succeeded in exploiting every caste in India. Ever since the caste became the established social order of the Hindus, they have lived under an imperialist regime in which a handful of superior men always monopolised power, wealth, enlightenment, religion and freedom and used these advantages to suppress and exploit the masses. This arrangement still continues and the Congress High Command represents this spirit of Brahmanism at its best. Thus replacement of British Imperialism by Brahman imperialism is their highest ambition.

So far we have dealt with the real cause which lies at the root of the present conflicting ideologies of the different parties in India. The main factors which nourished these forces are spread over a period of full one hundred years during which Hindu nationalism took a particular line of development culminating in the demands of Pakistan, Dravidstan and separate colonies by the Scheduled Castes, as a reaction

against their aggressive and exclusive spirit. The earliest phase of this movement was characterised by a very keen and deep hatred against the Muslims with the sole object of eliminating them from India in conjunction with the ruling power which had a just cause of enmity against them. The first manifestation of this militant spirit was the publication of the *Ananda Math* by Bankim Chandra Chatterji in Bengal in 1882. It is a novel which from one cover to the other preaches hatred against the whole Muslim community of India and inspires the reader with a religious fanaticism of the vilest form to rise against them as one man, to terrorise them into complete submission and utter annihilation. The start was well-timed: for then the British were bent upon wreaking their full vengeance on the Muslims. The book very cleverly cajoles the British and offers a hand of co-operation to them in their sacred mission of routing out the common *meleche* enemy. The notorious song of the *Bande Matram* is a special feature of the book and is sung on each and every occasion when fresh recruits are enlisted for the army in order to raid and destroy Muslim habitations in the country. You can well imagine the disgust which Muslims righteously feel when the Congress High Command insists on raising this anti-Muslim cry to the standard of a national song and then they add insult to

injury when they expect that we would stand up to pay our homage and thus associate ourselves with a movement whose sole mission was our very destruction. By identifying with this vile and abominable song the Congress stands totally condemned in the eyes of the Muslims.

Taking advantage of the British patronage, the Hindus had gained a complete control of the machinery of the Government in the country and thus, through their position of power, were able to achieve their object of eliminating Muslims. The pages of Dr. Hunter's well-known book *Our Indian Musalmans* is a brilliant exposition of the conspiracy hatched by the British and backed up by the forebears of the present Hindu leaders of the Congress who are so fond of attacking us for our cries of justice and fairplay in the recruitment to services. Even when the British realised, through their own policy and not for any love for us, that the time has come to stop patronising the Hindus alone, a great hue and cry was raised. The *Hindu Patriot* (Calcutta) in its issue of August 2, 1870 wrote that Muslims being *rebels* should not be encouraged in any way! Now the Hindu Press says that Muslims, being the *agents* of British imperialism, should not be encouraged in any way. Strange are the ways of hypocrisy masked as Nationalism! Entrenched safely in Government offices

these descendants of Brahman imperialists were bent upon achieving their object of Hindu revival in this land by all means at their disposal. "Already in Asoka's time the Brahmans had probably captured the Sangha (Buddhist monasteries) as effectively as in modern times they have controlled the inner working of British departmental machinery."¹ Brahmans accepted the new faith and from within corrupted and defiled the purity of Buddha's idealism. They were responsible for introducing idol worship and other most revolting practices into it and destroyed its strength by creating a great schism by detaching themselves under the name of Mahayana from the original doctrine of the faith.² The history of Brahmanic intrigues against Buddhism, which was a frontal attack against their vested interest, is being repeated before our very eyes. The existence of Muslims as a separate nation with a deep consciousness of their future destiny and mission in this very land of their birth is a standing challenge to their monopoly of power and so they are using every available force to crush us down by vile intrigues. But Islam is not Buddhism and we are confident that the base machinations of these native imperialists shall be soon exposed and they shall stand condemned before the bar of

¹ Havell, E. B. : *Aryan Rule in India*, p. 148.

² Samadder, J. N. : *The Glories of Magadha*, p. 167.

world opinion.

These nationalist fanatics were, however, not content with these petty privileges. They were bent upon achieving their object for which they could not wait for long. They launched a full-scale project of preparing their future generation for taking the reins of power which they were sure of getting. This spirit of nationalism expressed itself not in founding a national University but a Hindu University at Benares, the stronghold of Brahmanism. The spirit of the accursed caste system pervades the whole institution up to this day. Pandit Malaviya, as its custodian and guide, represents in his person the tradition of Brahman imperialistic aspirations of the ages. With the founding of this institution, the Hindus began to wage a relentless war against the Muslims. The first step in this direction, started from Benaras in 1867, was an attack against Urdu and advocacy of Hindi in Government offices of the country. As a matter of fact there is no great difference between the two languages except the name and the script. Urdu was the result of fruitful cultural contact of the two people and a symbol of their mutual love and toleration. A true national spirit would have at once taken advantage of this happy event and utilised it for the sake of creating a healthy atmosphere for future peace and harmony. But, unfortunately

for the country, Urdu was written in letters which reminded the Hindu nationalists of the Quran and this was simply unbearable. They could not tolerate the existence of Muslims as devotees of an alien religion. So it became their sacred duty to abolish this language once for all and thus root out the one symbol of Hindu-Muslim cultural fusion: for the future India of their dream was to be pure and unadulterated Aryan in which nothing reminiscent of Muslim rule could be tolerated.

Along with this, the forces of revivalism were being gradually encouraged. The first step in this direction was taken by the Brahmo Samaj (1828) founded by Raja Ram Mohan Roy who was greatly influenced both by Islam and Christianity. It started with a revolt against idolatry and other forms of priestcraft and later on made a protest, a feeble one, against caste-system. Though the first manifestation of Hindu national awakening, it could not penetrate to the masses, for its primary object was social reform and not political. It was not motivated by any hatred against the Muslims and therefore could not achieve the success it deserved. It was too much a business of the high-caste Hindus for their own improvement to grow into a national power. After giving to India some of her most distinguished leaders and patriots, it has relapsed into passivity and some

world opinion.

These nationalist fanatics were, however, not content with these petty privileges. They were bent upon achieving their object for which they could not wait for long. They launched a full-scale project of preparing their future generation for taking the reins of power which they were sure of getting. This spirit of nationalism expressed itself not in founding a national University but a Hindu University at Benares, the stronghold of Brahmanism. The spirit of the accursed caste system pervades the whole institution up to this day. Pandit Malaviya, as its custodian and guide, represents in his person the tradition of Brahman imperialistic aspirations of the ages. With the founding of this institution, the Hindus began to wage a relentless war against the Muslims. The first step in this direction, started from Benaras in 1867, was an attack against Urdu and advocacy of Hindi in Government offices of the country. As a matter of fact there is no great difference between the two languages except the name and the script. Urdu was the result of fruitful cultural contact of the two people and a symbol of their mutual love and toleration. A true national spirit would have at once taken advantage of this happy event and utilised it for the sake of creating a healthy atmosphere for future peace and harmony. But, unfortunately

Arya Samaj was much more allied in its spirit and new creed to Islam than to the traditional Sanatana Dharma. It was against idolatary and priestcraft and stood for the worship of One God; it worked for the emancipation of the people from the bondage of the superstitious tyranny of the corrupt priesthood. But inspite of this conspicuous religious antagonism between them, there is not a single occasion when these two sects of Hinduism came into collision. And notwithstanding all the similarities which it bears to Islam, Arya Samaj is the deadly foe of Muslims and their religion in every field of life. It is as it should be: for Hindu Nationalism cannot thrive unless Muslims as a distinct entity in India are totally eliminated from the field.

Till the beginning of the twentieth century, this militant spirit confined itself to developing in the people a deep seated hatred against the alien Muslims but with the passage of time it was bound to take some positive step towards the building up of a future state based upon the old ideology of Brahmanic supremacy throughout the length and breadth of India. This was supplied by Mr. Hardayal. He envisaged the formation of a political movement in the country in which the Muslims would be assigned the position of hewers of wood. He did not believe in Hindu-Muslim

silent good work. But the true spirit of aggressive and militant nationalism of Hindus was expressed by the founder of Arya Samaj (1875) who, learning from the in-effectiveness of the Brahmo Samaj, launched an ambitious scheme of political emancipation of the Hindus based on inculcating a deep enmity and hatred against the Muslims and their religion. So far as his crusade against the superstitious aspect of the people's faith was concerned, he did a magnificent thing and deserves our thanks. He succeeded to a great extent in bringing his followers out of the abyss of inhuman practices mis-called religious. "The true religion is found in the Vedas and the Upanishads," Mr. Dayanand says, "which enjoin that learned persons should teach and preach truth to the people, and show them the necessity of abandoning falsehood and of doing good to all." Does it not strike strange that a reform movement based on such broad principles of humanitarianism should have been all along nourished on a deep animosity against the Muslims? It is strange but not unnatural. The whole force of Hindu Nationalism—it may be reformist, revivalist, humanitarian,—had, of necessity, to turn its face against us if it were to achieve its primary object of establishing the Ram Raj, a dream which Brahman imperialists have been dreaming. Looking at the nature of the reform itself,

Arya Samaj was much more allied in its spirit and new creed to Islam than to the traditional Sanatana Dharma. It was against idolatary and priestcraft and stood for the worship of One God; it worked for the emancipation of the people from the bondage of the superstitious tyranny of the corrupt priesthood. But inspite of this conspicuous religious antagonism between them, there is not a single occasion when these two sects of Hinduism came into collision. And notwithstanding all the similarities which it bears to Islam, Arya Samaj is the deadly foe of Muslims and their religion in every field of life. It is as it should be: for Hindu Nationalism cannot thrive unless Muslims as a distinct entity in India are totally eliminated from the field.

Till the beginning of the twentieth century, this militant spirit confined itself to developing in the people a deep seated hatred against the alien Muslims but with the passage of time it was bound to take some positive step towards the building up of a future state based upon the old ideology of Brahmanic supremacy throughout the length and breadth of India. This was supplied by Mr. Hardayal. He envisaged the formation of a political movement in the country in which the Muslims would be assigned the position of hewers of wood. He did not believe in Hindu-Muslim

unity on a basis of equality and wanted the Hindus to be the leaders and the Muslims to be the camp-followers alone. "In using the word *Sawarajya* and appealing to the people we arouse *Hindu associations*. We would ask the Muhammadans to join us but we must *keep their masses under Hindu leadership*. If you give them Muhammadan leaders, you tread on dangerous grounds." In 1909 Lala Lajpat Rai and other Hindu nationalists emphasised the true political aspirations of their community by declaring that Hindus were a nation by themselves distinct from Muslims and therefore there was no point in the claim of the Congress that Indians were one nation. This was the true and natural culminating point of Hindu national spirit which meant to acquire power for itself alone. Mr. Hardayal could not tolerate any joint Hindu-Muslim State in India: state must belong to the Hindus and the Muslims may live in it as serfs. He says: "To attain *Sawaraj* we do not need Muslim assistance, nor is it our desire to establish a joint rule...If you attain *Sawaraj* with Muslim help, eternal will be your dependence on the Muslims. Leave them, therefore, all alone." On the basis of this ideology Hindu Mahasabha was reorganised in 1923 with the double programme of *Shuddhi* and *Sanghathan*. The

Hindu religion has consistently no room for conversion because, strictly speaking, it is not religion at all: Hinduism is a mere name for the conglomeration of irreconcilable faiths. But then the relative position of Hindu and Muslim population was a very acute problem for those who wanted to establish a purely Hindu Raj. It was possible to silence 10 or 20 millions of Muslims scattered all over India but it was practically impossible to eradicate 70 millions especially from the North West corner of India. Leaving aside the Frontier and Sind (which were not till then separate provinces), the Punjab and Bengal alone mattered to these Hindu nationalists, where Muslims were growing into a majority. For a people dreaming of a future Hindu Raj, it was a dismal prospect. So the only remedy which they could prescribe to cut short the annual growth of Muslim population was to reconvert them and thus reduce their threatening numbers. An appeal for ten lakh of rupees was made to the Hindus by Pt. Malaviya, Lala Lajpat Rai, Raja Narindra Nath and others to found a memorial for Shradanand with the purpose of reducing Muslims of India to a nonentity. We give below a few of the relevant quotations from different sources which display the real spirit underlying the first move. The Editor of the *Partap* says, "The question of *Shuddhi* is a matter of life and

death for the Hindus. Muslims have grown from zero to 70 million and Christians are 4 million. It is difficult for 220 millions of Hindus to live in the face of 70 million Muslims...A religion should be propagated for the sake of religion but Hindus are forced to adopt this procedure on account of several other reasons." Another nationalist in Delhi declared, "Hindu-Muslim unity is impossible without Shuddhi. When all Muslims will be converted to Hinduism, everybody in India would be Hindu and then no power on earth can thwart our march to freedom." This programme of conversion was popularised by Hindu poets who excited the public by their pithy verses:

"Our mission of *Shuddhi* should in no way be made to suffer. This golden opportunity is God-sent. O Hindus! If there is any faith in you, let there remain not a single Muslim in this world."

Similarly the other aspect of the programme was equally directed against the Muslims. The following statements of the leading Hindu leaders speak for themselves.

"Just as England is for the English, France for the French, so is India for the Hindus...If the Muslims wish to co-operate with us *unconditionally*, we shall welcome them; otherwise Hindus should march on

alone.”

“The Sawarajya movement has been started by the Hindus for the last several hundred years. The Hindu Sanghtan is to give a practical shape to the law of Manu.”

“When Hindu *Sanghtan* will result in attaining Sawarajya, then we shall turn towards Muslims and Christians. Our policy shall be declared. There shall be no need of mutual understanding or compromise. The Hindu Mahasabha will proclaim its decision defining the rights and duties of Muslims and Christians in the new National Government of India and announce the conditions of *Shuddhi*.”

“I think that the future of Muslims will be very dark unless they become nationalists. If they are willing to remain religious fanatics and agents of British Government, then the people of India (*i.e.* Hindus) would rise against them. Their salvation lies only on the path of nationalism.”

“If India can attain Sawaraj, it is possible only through Hindu culture...Hindu Sanghtan is being organised because the Hindus alone are the torch-bearers of the ancient culture of India. Some people ask, Should, then, Muslims leave the country? I do not subscribe to this thesis. Just as small rivulets join the Ganges and still it does not change its name, similarly the

basic culture in India shall be only Hindu... The real quarrel is not of religion but of culture."

"The fundamental principle of the Sawaraj Party should be that every Indian child should study only Indian literature, adopt only Indian culture and follow only faiths of Indian origin. If any community refuses to accept it, then it should be turned out of India to the desert of Arabia."

"Hindus should try to get British patronage and keep the key posts of the administration in their hands. Their first duty is to weaken the Muslims with the help of the British and strengthen the Hindus. It is only when this step has been fully carried out that Sawaraj can be attained."¹

These are only a few utterances, frank and honest, which have been selected at random from a voluminous literature on this subject. Besides the main object of proving that the whole movement of Hindu nationalism was aimed at liquidating Muslims, their religion and culture, these statements, strangely speaking, show a remarkable affinity to the utterances and deeds of the present Congress leaders. The real significance of these statements cannot be brushed aside by the critics by saying that these are the outbursts of Hindu Communalists. Yes, it is true, but the fact

¹ *India House, Op. cit.*, pp. 172-173.

remains that the ideal of Hindu Raj which these nationalists laid before their co-religionists during 1906-1927 served as the beacon light for the Congress Ministries during the 27 months of their regime in the Hindu majority provinces. Almost all the Congress leaders repeat these very 'axiomatic truths': that Hindus and Muslims have the same culture, that their religion is the greatest obstacle in the attainment of freedom, that the path of nationalism alone is the right path, that the Muslims must co-alesce with the Congress unconditionally, that whoever stands in the way of the Congress shall be totally smashed—all these have a strange family resemblance to the above quoted utterances.

We have traced very briefly the course which national consciousness of the Hindus took. So long as the Muslims were cent per cent anti-British, it allied itself with the rulers and its venom was expressed solely against the Muslims. This unholy alliance of the two succeeded in bringing the Muslims to knees and destroying their economic and social position in the country. Monopolising all the avenues of Government service, they banged the door against the Muslims in every field, a policy which is being tenaciously followed even up till now. Realising that they have gained their first objective and have become sufficiently strong, they gradually became anti-British

in their attitude. But at this stage they wanted the co operation of the Muslims so as to keep up the show of a united front. The Muslims were, therefore, invited to join the movement, with one reservation, of course : there should be no prior claim for settling the differences, freedom should have preference over our domestic problems. Does not Pt. Nehru repeat this in so many words even now? This shows a clear alliance between the ideologies of the Mahasabha and the Congress with this difference only that the former is frank about its position while the latter deems it better to cloak its inner motives under the mask of liberalism. The Congress was founded in 1885 and Dr. Pattabhi explicitly admits that it was the culmination of Hindu nationalism, which earlier manifested itself in the Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj etc. "All these movements," he says, "were really so many threads in the strand of Indian Nationalism, and the nation's duty was to evolve a synthesis so as to be able to dispel prejudice and superstition, to renovate and purify the old faith, the Vedantic idealism, and reconcile it with the Nationalism of the new age. The Indian National Congress was destined to fulfil this great mission." The aim of the Congress was, thus, to achieve a synthesis of all the divergent tendencies in Indian life. But what kind of synthesis? One in which

Hindus and Muslims would have an equal share? Not at all. This synthesis was to be based solely on a purified old faith, such as, for instance, Arya Samaj had suggested in its programme of *Sanghtan* and *Shuddhi*. The mission of the Congress was to reconcile this new faith with nationalism of the age, i.e., to impose upon all the different communities of India a single pattern of culture, apparently called Indian but in reality Hindu in its spirit and manifestation. The policy of the Congress during 1937-39 in Hindu provinces was to fulfil the mission set before it by the founder of the Arya Samaj and it was therefore not unnatural that communal riots during these years were as numerous as those inspired by the Mahasabha in 1923-25.

Before we leave this topic, it is essential that we should take notice of certain perfectly dishonest attempts made by some Congress apologists to prove that the outbursts of Hindu leaders do not represent the true Congress mind and that these were a sort of answer to the Muslims' claim for separation. The authors of the *Communal Triangle in India* (Mahasabhites of Congress pattern) who seem to specialise in propagating lies and falsehood, claim: "Hindu communalism has been an irritant and a reaction to Muslim communalism."¹ How untrue the statement is can be easily

¹ P. 181.

realised in the light of facts enumerated above. Hindu nationalism was militant from the very start and was directed against the Muslims and yet these Congress Hindus think that the world is going to believe this falsehood. The utterances of Hindu leaders which we have quoted all refer to 1906-27 and these learned authors, in spite of their prejudice, have not been able to bring forth any anti-Hindu demonstration of feeling on the part of Indian Muslims during this period. It was only after the Mahasabha launched its programme of Hinduising all, that the Muslims realised the gravity of the situation. While drawing a list of similarities in the attitude of the League and the Mahasabha, they assert that "both the League and Mahasabha have a great belief in militarism. The Hindu Mahasabha has actually set up a board called the Hindu Militarization Mandal". But here they stop. Where is the equivalent of this Mandal in the League? There is none and so they could not go beyond uttering an untruth. Militarization was the most important item of the programme of the Hindu Mahasabha by which they intended to terrorise the Muslims by organising country-wide riots during 1923-27. In the same spirit of prejudice they bracket the two utterances of Mr. Fazl-ul Haq of Bengal and Mr. Hardayal so as to give an impression

that the latter's utterance was a sort of answer to the former's challenge. They say, "Mr. Fazl-ul-Haq said that if Muhammad Bin Kasim, an eight years old lad with eighteen soldiers (?) could conquer Sind, then surely nine crores of Muslims could conquer the whole of India. Lala Hardayal went further and advised: if Hindus want to protect themselves, they must conquer Afghanistan and the frontiers and convert (them and) all the mountain tribes."¹ How cleverly these authors arrange facts to prove that Muslims alone are responsible for creating deadlock! Mr. Hardayal expressed these sentiments in 1906 while Mr. Fazl-ul-Haq held out his threat in 1938 when the Congress had embarked on the path of combating and undermining the cultural existence of Muslims of India. Mr. Hardayal's utterance was aggressive, militant and unprovoked while Mr. Fazl-ul-Haq's statement was defensive and held out as a threat, provoked by a series of events which the general consensus of Muslim opinion held to be aimed against their existence. We can well realise the honesty and integrity of these writers in expounding the history of our political life and telling us that Pakistan will not benefit us!

At the Madras session of the Muslim League, the Qaid-i-Azam, referring to the

Madras province, said, "Imagine what these three percent of the high castes (Brahmins) can do by skilful manœuvring and by skilful methods of electioneering. Three percent of these have secured a majority rule. Is this democracy?" Commenting on this frank statement, exposing the vile technique of Congress imperialists, the authors say: "A movement that was started to maintain the solidarity of the Muslim community ended in invading the integrity of the Hindu community."¹ How cleverly these apologists of the Congress nationalism distort a simple statement of facts! When Muslims demand their right of self-determination as a nation it is preposterous to their ears and when the non-Brahmans of South India cry for the recognition of their rights, it is disintegration of the Hindu community. Is this the type of nationalism they are so proud of displaying? Is this their love of democracy that they are willing to trample under their feet millions of the out-castes of South India? If Hindus have a right to national existence, every other group which feels the same urge has an equal right to expression. But their nationalism is in reality imperialism which feels proud at the spectacle of millions of non-Hindus lying under their feet and their democracy is full blooded tyranny of majority rule which not only the Muslims

¹ *Forward Press, 12 Feb., p. 20.*

but even the untouchables and Dravidians of the South India are equally resolute to combat. What is, after all, the Hindu community whose integrity is said to be invaded? A certain percentage of high caste Brahmins who look upon the code of Manu as the sheet-anchor of their future Indian National Government, who by their threats of fast-unto-death have coerced the outcastes to remain within their folds so as to utilise their majority for retaining political power which they refuse to share with their truly accredited representatives. Hindu community stands disintegrated by the very reason of its socio-religious structure as soon as the lower castes, the real backbone of their majority, realise their true position and attain to self-consciousness. It is only the ghost of British Imperialism and the alleged fight against it that is keeping it integrated and now these native imperialists have found in Pakistan another ghost to frighten them into submission. The real reason why these Congress nationalists are not willing to tackle the most essential problem of social reform before attaining power is the conviction that once they leave attacking the foreign rulers the whole structure of Hindu society would fall asunder, everybody claiming right of self-determination. It actually happened when the Congress in 1937-39 plunged headlong into working out the constructive

programme. But the world war came to their rescue and they were glad to go to wilderness rather than see the grand edifice of a future Imperial Power go to pieces. Once they attain full power with the assurance from the British of complete non-interference in their internal affairs, they are determined to punish all those elements of the country who raised any discordant note of protest and crush their spirit of self-consciousness. It is the imperialistic way of dealing with the weak. These people come forward to attack us because we claim the right of self-determination. They say that we should not put forth our demand because it means their dis-integration! A strange logic. Did the Congress refrain from taking sides, during the movement against the Partition of Bengal, started purely for maintaining Hindu monopoly of power at the cost of Muslims? Was it not Mr. Tilak, the topmost leader of the Congress, who started the Sivaji cult and poisoned the heart of the Hindus against the Muslims? Was not the Arya Samaj started to crush us out of existence? With such black records these Congress apologists come forward and accuse us of attacking the integrity of the Hindu community. Mr. Jinnah very recently declared that the whole movement sponsored by him is in no way directed against the Hindu community but is solely directed against the British.

But the tragedy is that our demand of Pakistan, whether it is really anti-Hindu or not, does go against the realisation of their dream of an undiluted Brahman Imperialistic domination of the whole of India and so one falsehood after another is spoken and written to prove its untenability.

The authors accuse the Qaid-i-Azam, as the leader of the Muslim League, that he has not been sticking to one particular line of policy but changing his demands from year to year with the sole object of attaining power. The whole chapter is vitiated with wrong statements and the greatest feat has been displayed by taking events out of their true context and placing in a wrong perspective to prove that the League had no programme during all these years except of discrediting the opponents and gaining power for itself.¹ No body can deny the sincerity of purpose and the assiduous labour which the Qaid-i-Azam displayed during the period ending with the Round Table Conferences for the sake of Hindu-Muslim settlement. But the only obstacle in the way of solution was that while the Hindus were fully organised, Muslims had no political organisation worth the name which could claim the support of the masses. Hindus of the Congress always utilised this unfortunate position as an

¹ Ibid., Chap. 12, pp. 193-210.

excuse for not accepting the most reasonable offers of the League. Was there not a time when the Qaid-i-Azam was ready to accept joint electorates with reservation of seats which the Sapru Committee has suggested now? But the position has now changed. The Muslims have become self-conscious, they wish to exercise their right of self determination as a nation and so the question of separate or joint electorates does not arise now. The question of Hindu Muslim settlement cannot be taken at present in the old context it must be considered in the perspective of the present urge of the Muslims for the creation of their own homelands in the North West and North East of India. It does not become the Congress apologists to accuse Mr. Jinnah for the change of front it is the Congress lust for power and the ideal of Hindu Raj which have led one party after another to demand separate existence in India. In 1935-36 when there was still no question of Congress atrocities Mr. Jinnah declared "Many efforts had been made since 1921 till the Round Table Conference to settle the Hindu Muslim question. At that time I knew no pride and used to leg from the Congress. I worked so incessantly to bring about a rapprochement that a newspaper remarked that Mr. Jinnah is never tired of Hindu Muslim unity but I received shock of my life at the meeting of the Round Table

Conference. In the face of danger the Hindu sentiment, the Hindu mind, the Hindu attitude led me to the conclusion that there was no hope of unity." We cannot go into the detail of events that convinced this "ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity" that the Hindus did not wish the problem to be solved. They were merely marking time so that the British may be made to part with power and then they would be free to deal with the irreconcilable elements of the country as they had been doing with the untouchables since centuries. But Providence willed otherwise and the Round Table Conferences exposed the true character of these so-called Nationalists. Viewed in this light the braying of such Congress apologists deserves severest condemnation. Besides being insincere in their claims of sole representation of 400 million people of India they are thoroughly dishonest.

CHAPTER THREE

Nationalism or Imperialism ?

In celebrating the Diamond Jubilee of the Indian 'National' Congress at Bombay, Sardar Patel is reported to have said, in reply to the Qaid-i-Azam's assurance that the Muslim League was not fighting the Hindus but the British, "If Pakistan is to be achieved, the first duty of the League is to free the country. First work for freedom of the land and then you can share the fruits of your sweat and sacrifice."¹ This summary of his speech is the best exposition of the Hindu mind. Those who were till yesterday not willing to concede the principle of Pakistan and threatening us with civil war, if we persist in our demand of disintegration of India, are today ready to offer it to us provided we first join them in the fight for freedom. But the whole nature of the offer is altered with this *if*: for to us this '*if*' implies a condition that our past experiences do not lead us to accept. Pt. Nehru and other leaders of the Congress have been dinnng into our ears time and again the importance of freedom of the country for the sake

¹ *Times*, Dec. 20, 1945, p. 1.

of which we should sacrifice all other interests. After freedom is attained our problems can be solved in no time. With the departure of the British rulers from India will come communal unity, Hindu-Muslim understanding etc. But are these leaders of the Congress justified in advocating this principle? Does it not mean that we should join their ranks unconditionally and fight the British for their sake, just as the Hindu nationalists have been preaching to us? Does it not mean the whole ideology of the Mahasabha in other and better words? But instead of entering into a discussion of the motives behind these utterances, it would be better for us to determine what pattern of government the Congress would wish to establish in this land when freedom is achieved. Shall it be in accordance with our wishes or shall it be contrary to our aspirations as Muslims? This is a most vital question for us to decide. So long as we wish to retain our identity as Muslims, we shall have to think twice before taking any decisive step.

The type of the future Government of the country as envisaged by the Congress was once expounded by Mr. B. Desai in a public address at Simla in August, 1938. We shall take it as the best expression of the ideal of the Congress. The Government of the country, according to him,

would be national, democratic, secular. The first item in this triad is the national characteristic of the future state based on the assumption that all the people inhabiting India form one homogeneous nation. From the very start (1885) this idea has been the main stay of this organisation. The Congress called itself national not because it was conscious of Indians being one nation but because the British politicians deemed it the best course possible under the circumstances partly for their own convenience and partly because they could not imagine any pattern of government except the one that was prevalent in their own country. This territorial nationalism, which was popular in Europe at the time, was grafted into our country without ever realising whether the people inhabiting this sub continent could, by any stretch of imagination, be regarded as one nation. It is a fact that when the Congress was started Muslims as a collective group did not exist. They had been reduced to the level of serfs thanks to the efforts both of the British rulers and the Hindus. But what started as a mere assumption came to be looked upon as the gospel truth. Later events proved that this idea of territorial nationalism based on the nation state theory of Mill was highly profitable to the majority group here and so they have very tenaciously held on to it inspite of opposition

from different camps. In answer to criticism levelled against Mr. Rajagopalacharia, for using violent means for imposing Hindi on all the people of the presidency, the majority of whom called themselves non-Brahmins or Dravidians, Mr. Gandhi says, "Is India one country and one nation or many countries and many nations? Those who look upon India as one country and one nation should not raise any objections if the Prime Minister of Madras employs the violent and coercive powers of the Criminal Law Amendment Act for imposing one language on one nation."¹ The use of coercion may or may not be justifiable in a country inhabited by one nation but the question was not this. The Dravidians of the South had refused to merge their existence into the high-caste Hindus and to impose one common language on them was surely not only wrong but criminal, even on the showing of Mr. Gandhi. But the point before us is that he very cleverly side-tracks the real issue and accepts the one nation theory as a fact. Pt. Nehru does not feel the necessity of raising any doubt in this respect. He is ready and willing to accept this myth in a great flourish of language dressed in modern scientific terminology to make it look rational. "The Muslim nation in India—a nation within a nation, and not even compact, but vague,

¹ *Harijan*, Sept. 10, 1938. Passage is retranslated from Urdu.

spread out, indeterminate. Politically, the idea is absurd, economically it is fantastic; it is hardly worth considering... To talk of a 'Muslim nation', therefore, means that there is no nation at all but a religious bond; it means that no nation in the modern sense must be allowed to grow; it means that modern civilisation should be discarded and we should go back to the medieval ways; it means either autocratic government or a foreign government; it means, finally, just nothing at all except an emotional state of mind and a conscious or un-conscious desire not to face realities, especially economic realities... But this idea of a Muslim nation is the figment of a few imaginations only, and, but for the publicity given to it by the Press, few people would have heard of it. And even if many people believed in it, it would still vanish at the touch of reality."¹

This long passage requires our closest scrutiny: for whole force of Congress attack against Pakistan rests upon a thesis, a part of which is expressed here in such clear-cut words. His first point is that a nation formed on an ideological basis is incompatible with, and inconceivable in, the context of a territorial nationalism. The ideal of this type of nationalism grew and developed in Europe in the last century and its theoretical foundation was laid by

¹ *India's Geography*, p. 452 (1st cheap ed.)

Mill who was in favour of nation-states, *i.e.*, the boundaries of a state should coincide in the main with that of a nation. Pt. Nehru accepts this theory and builds his whole case against the existence of a Muslim nation on this basis. But has he forgotten the lesson which the development of this sort of nationalism in Europe teaches us? The basic element in nationalism is the belief that every nation has a right to political independence. But it does not stop at that. If the nation as a people possess absolute sovereignty, nationalism comes to mean that the right of a nation is supreme over all other rights. The interests of individuals and the claims of humanity alike disappear in the face of the absolute right of the nation. Internally, the nation becomes supreme and all-embracing, externally it asserts the superiority of its claims over those of all other nations, and as soon as its power permits, in a bound it passes to imperialism. This was the result of nationalism in Europe and is equally manifest in India. The so-called nationalists of the Congress brand are assuming fascist and imperialistic attitudes towards the upsurge of other nationalities within their bounds.

Nurtured and developed under the patronage of the foreign masters Hindu nationalism is now fully strong and self-conscious and is engaged in a fight with

them for the sake of attaining power but in relation to the rising consciousness of the erstwhile backward classes, Muslims, untouchables and Dravidians, it is adopting imperialistic technique. It is in the very logic of nationalism which Pt. Nehru so much admires as a sign of modernism. But the problem of the modern age *par excellence* is how to save humanity from this dangerous abyss of destruction. The solution lies in a re-interpretation of the true basis of the state. It had been linked in the past with race, colour, tongue and country and all have failed to bring true peace to the world. The only possible mean of escaping the otherwise certain destruction is to form a state on a pure alone will help in outlook in our collective life, an attitude which the narrow territorial and racial divisions of mankind seem so far to have crushed out of us. The feeble attempts to circumvent the horrible consequences of nationalism after the first Great War by the formation of the League of Nations were bound to fail for they started at a dis-advantage. The League by its very conception admitted the principle of aggressive nationalism and imperialism and so could not stem the tide of annihilation of modern civilization. Islam alone gives us a complete picture of a state which is ideological from one end

to the other. It cuts across racial and geographical boundaries. Any and every man is welcome to enter the party only if he accepts the creed. Its object is not limited to benefit a particular class of people, the proletariat, and to exterminate the bourgeoisie; it does not aim at making one particular nation the mightiest of the mighty and exploiting the rest for its interests; it is absolutely beyond its intentions to exalt a particular race of mankind as the super-race beside which all others are like slaves. Its mission, on the other hand, is for the whole mankind. It puts before them certain basic principles on which it wants to erect a state and a culture which, it claims, is beneficial to all mankind without any distinction. It opens its gates to all and sundry and invites them to its fold. A history of religions would reveal that in early stages, it was only national as religions of India, Greece and Egypt. Then came a stage when it became racial as in the case of Judaism. To Christianity religion was nothing but a private affair and thus could play no part in the social life of its people. It was Islam alone which taught that religion is neither national nor racial nor individual or private but an affair of humanity in general. It aims not only at moral transformation of man but wants to produce a gradual, though fundamental, orientation in the collective

life of mankind which may succeed in superseding the national and racial outlooks and help in creating a sort of purely human and international consciousness.

Marxist Communism was the best type of this ideological state in the modern world, though its appeal to the merely economic aspect of our life was greatly responsible for distorting its potential human outlook on life. It tried to create an international party, members of which were drawn from different nations and races. The characteristic rallying cry of Marx was : workers of the world, unite ! But the strangest irony is that the learned Pandit while subscribing to the Marxian creed of history and revolutionary technique, here shows himself to be perfectly anti-Marxist. In advocating the cause of Indian nationalism which is in reality Hindu in its character, he forgets that it is perfectly inconsistent with his international ideology of communist type. It is impossible for us to believe that a man who can well understand and appreciate the true significance of Marxist philosophy is not able to appreciate the attitude of Muslims of India towards their claim of a separate nationality which is equally ideological, international and extraterritorial in spirit. But the real reason why Pt. Nehru is unwilling to accept this position is that it goes against his national-cum-imperialist aspira-

tions. Moreover, the recent events in India and the part which he is playing have gone far to convince us that his allegiance to Marxian socialism is only superficial. It is not the words but deeds which show a man what he is. Only recently Mr. Gandhi said that "his own relations with the capitalist friends typified the attitude of the Congress towards the capitalist class. He freely accepted the hospitality of capitalists like the Birlas and made use of their money to serve the cause of the poor but the latter did not expect anything in return from him."¹ A Marxian Nehru and an orthodox capitalist Gandhi make a good pair in the Congress High Command where the former is always willing to compromise his principles in order to placate the Bapu.

His objection against Muslim nation on the ground that it is not compact but vague, spread out and indeterminate is equally irrelevant. By calling it vague and indeterminate he was perhaps referring to the unorganised position of the Muslims of those days (1935) and he is quite right there. It was the lack of any united front on the part of the Muslims then that encouraged him to assert such preposterous claims against us. The last lines of the quotation clearly show that he was joyfully expecting

¹ *Tribune*, Dec. 27, 1945, p. 4. Referring to the last line, the *Dawn* remarked, "Verily the Golden Age has come and Mammon wins his way where seraphs might despair." Dec. 31, p. 4.

the day when this dreamy vision of a Muslim nation would vanish from the face of India. But if wishes were horses beggars would ride. Instead of being vague and indeterminate, it has grown into a full stature and is staring in their faces. The Muslim nation in India is now an organised force and has given its unequivocal verdict in favour of Pakistan. But it is unimaginable how he could assert, even then, that Muslim nation was not compact. Is not the north west of India a compact contiguous area in which Muslims are decidedly in a majority? It was the same in 1935. Thus there is no political absurdity or economic fantasy in our claim except that it limits the field for their imperialist exploitation.

Secondly, his objections against our claim of distinct nationality are based on the following grounds: 1) It has a religious basis and therefore incompatible with modern conception of the growth of nations. As such it implies a negation of modern civilisation and acceptance of an autocratic form of government, in short, a return to pure and simple medievalism. 2) It is an emotional state of mind and a conscious or unconscious desire not to face realities, especially economic nature.

say ; first, we may
realit, ; iy is in
aware-

ness of a sort of alliance among the members and is decidedly an emotional attitude. Pt. Nehru's crusade for united India on behalf of his type of nationalism is equally emotional and sentimental. Psychologically, an emotional state of mind is perhaps the only motive force which enlivens the life of an individual: without it there would be no charm, no love, no romance, no sacrifice and no martyrdom. Not a single moment of our life can be said to be un-affected by it. Along with cognition and volition, feeling constitutes the very core of our psychological make-up. Certain psychologists, like McDougall, are definitely of opinion that this affective aspect of our life supplies the only dynamic force necessary for a proper adjustment to our environment. That feeling is the very core of the consciousness of nationalism in a people can be proved by reference to several eminent authors. Dr. Ambedkar, for instance, says that nationality "is a *feeling* of a corporate *sentiment* of oneness which makes those who are charged with it *feel* that they are kith and kin."¹ So the learned Pandit's attack against our national aspirations to be merely an emotional state of mind does not so much go against us as condemn him for his ignorance or hypocrisy. He adds: "(It implies) a conscious or unconscious desire not to f-

¹ *Thoughts on Pakistan*, p. 25

realities, especially economic realities." It is beyond our comprehension how this charge can be levelled against us. What are realities, economic or otherwise, to which he is referring? Does it not mean that acceptance of Muslims as a nation will go against the economic interests of the Hindus? If that is a fact, then, perhaps, Panditji is merely arguing against us not on the merits of the case but on the basis of the interests of the Hindu industrialists, financiers, speculators and commercialists, who form the backbone of the Hindu society and the Congress.

His other objection is that rise of nationalities in modern Europe was due to purely non-religious causes and in not one case was religious bond the basic link. We have already discussed that the territorial and racial nationalism of the 19th century Europe having proved greatly destructive gave place to the ideological bond of unity as in the rise of Communism and socialism in the 20th century and therefore the Pandit's brand of nationalism is already obsolete and antique and on the way to medievalism. Yet it is a strange logic which leads him to call the phenomenon of the birth of national spirit in a people medieval. The rise of nationalities as distinct entities is by itself a creation of the modern spirit, a situation which was hardly noticeable in the medieval period

at all. It is only in modern India that so many nationalities have appeared as definite anti-imperialist forces, asserting at the same time their inherent right to self-determination. History proves that wherever this demand has been accepted, there has been a march forward, while its non-acceptance has meant relapsing into medievalism. Thus it is the fascist attitude of the Congress trying to pull back the forward push of our national right of self-determination that is medieval, destructive and disintegrating. Addressing the students of the University of the Peoples of the East, Stalin said in 1924, "Nowadays India is spoken of as a single whole. Yet there can be hardly any doubt that in the case of a revolutionary upheaval in India, many hitherto unknown nationalities will emerge on the scene."¹

It may, however, be said that it is not the birth of a new nation that is medieval but the religious bond on which it is being nourished that makes it medieval. But if the religious bond is undesirable the only other bases for the formation of nationalities can be racial, territorial or linguistic. Let us first take the racial bond. In the present century Hitler made this bond the mainstay of the National-Socialist state in Germany. He proclaimed that Aryans inhabiting Germany were the purest

¹ *Dawn*, Dec. 31, 1945, p. 4

realities, especially economic realities" It is beyond our comprehension how this charge can be levelled against us What are realities, economic or otherwise, to which he is referring? Does it not mean that acceptance of Muslims as a nation will go against the economic interests of the Hindus? If that is a fact, then, perhaps, Panditji is merely arguing against us not on the merits of the case but on the basis of the interests of the Hindu industrialists, financiers, speculators and commercialists, who form the backbone of the Hindu society and the Congress

His other objection is that rise of nationalities in modern Europe was due to purely non religious causes and in not one case was religious bond the basic link We have already discussed that the territorial and racial nationalism of the 19th century Europe having proved greatly destructive gave place to the ideological bond of unity as in the rise of Communism and socialism in the 20th century and therefore the Pandit's brand of nationalism is already obsolete and antique and on the way to medievalism Yet it is a strange logic which leads him to call the phenomenon of the birth of national spirit in a people medieval The rise of nationalities as distinct entities is by itself a creation of the modern spirit, a situation which was hardly noticeable in the medieval period,

at all. It is only in modern India that so many nationalities have appeared as definite anti-imperialist forces, asserting at the same time their inherent right to self-determination. History proves that wherever this demand has been accepted, there has been a march forward, while its non-acceptance has meant relapsing into medievalism. Thus it is the fascist attitude of the Congress trying to pull back the forward push of our national right of self-determination that is medieval, destructive and disintegrating. Addressing the students of the University of the Peoples of the East, Stalin said in 1924, "Nowadays India is spoken of as a single whole. Yet there can be hardly any doubt that in the case of a revolutionary upheaval in India, many hitherto unknown nationalities will emerge on the scene."¹

It may, however, be said that it is not the birth of a new nation that is medieval but the religious bond on which it is being nourished that makes it medieval. But if the religious bond is undesirable the only other bases for the formation of nationalities can be racial, territorial or linguistic. Let us first take the racial bond. In the present century Hitler made this bond the mainstay of the National-Socialist state in Germany. He proclaimed that Aryans inhabiting Germany were the purest

¹ *Dawn*, Dec. 31, 1945, p. 4

specimen of human race and should not therefore be allowed to be defiled by any admixture with the impure Hebrew race. It was this racial outlook that was responsible for the persecution of the Jews. But Hitler alone is not to blame in this respect. Different nations at different times raised a similar cry of racialism for closing their ranks. Turanians, Slavs and Anglo-Saxons had all in their time been advocating it. This was in reality the most indeterminate of all the bonds because, strictly speaking, there are no pure races in the world whose blood is free from admixture with that which flows in other races. In the endless vicissitudes of human migrations and conquest all the streams of human life, parted from some unknown and doubtless single source, have met, mingled and parted again. So if races cannot be regarded as pure biological categories then it is meaningless to form a nation on such a doubtful ground. Even if racial affinity has any charm, then, is it not better to look to our common human ancestry? All humanity belongs to one race, descendants of same father and same mother, whose blood runs in all without distinction. Similarly the territorial basis is equally shaky and uninspiring in the real sense. If one's place of birth is to be the criterion then Delhi is no more my native place than New York. Being

born in a particular house in Lahore does not, on any reasonable ground, entitle me to claim that I am an Indian. Why should I not say that I am an Asiatic? Some would go so far even but then stop there and yet there would be no logic in it. The barriers of mountains, rivers and oceans are arbitrary for this purpose. The more reasonable and perhaps most consistent attitude will be to claim world-citizenship in the literal sense. I was born on this earth as good as any body else and all this expanse of water and earth is my home. These materialistic distinctions, of geography and race, are all unreasonable and in-effective in producing a security of environment that is so essential for the peaceful working of human society. They all raised their heads due to our ignorance of the deeper meaning of human life and destiny. They lack the requisite cohesive force required for the stability of our present civilisation. Even pragmatically judged they have failed to satisfy the highest aspirations of mankind.

Scientifically considered, the evolutionary progress of the human race towards the formation of nation-states should not have been allowed to stagnate. The urge which led man to form families and then to integrate families into clans and lastly to incorporate different clans and tribes into a higher unit of a nation-state should

have, in normal circumstances, led them to integrate into a full world state. It is the greatest tragedy of our life that the tendency to larger integration inspired by this motive has not already proceeded to its logical conclusion. The one great deterrent factor in this evolutionary process has been the historical background of European politics. The ideal of collective security which we need so much today was a reality during the Middle Ages but, unfortunately, the basic factor of the medieval civilization, viz, Christianity, was incapable of developing it to its logical end. What we call Christianity today is not in reality what Christ meant it to be but rather what St Paul made it. It was through the efforts of the latter that Christ's message was torn out of the Jewish context and made independent of the Mosaic Law. Thus deprived of this fundamental ground, Christianity confined itself to the problem of individual salvation. It gradually became otherworldly in outlook and developed into a purely monastic order. Considered in this light, the revolt of Luther was perfectly justified and natural. He was not against the humanising influence of religion but against the cramping influence of a barren church organisation. Luther's revolt was not against any system of polity of a secular nature for the obvious reason that there was no such polity.

associated with Christianity. But unfortunately this revolt while destroying the church organisation swept off the whole collective life of Europe. The result was "the break-up of the one into mutually ill-adjusted many, the transformation of a human into national outlook, requiring a more realistic foundation, such as the notion of country, and finding expression through varying systems of polity evolved on national lines, i.e., on lines which recognise territory as the only principle of political solidarity...The universal ethics of Jesus is displaced by national systems of ethics and polity."¹ Having no cohesive force which a dynamic religion alone could supply, the different countries of Europe, motivated by conflicting loyalties, drifted away from one another and plunged the whole world into one war after another, which have been responsible for more bloodshed than all the so-called religious wars of antiquity.

Alongside the forces of destruction inherent in territorial nationalism which thwarted the realization of a common ideology, the people of the West made striding progress in the field of positive science which provided man with means of good life on an un-precedented scale. The moral and spiritual deterioration, on the one hand, and magnificent achievements in the domain of science, on the other, are the

¹ Iqbal: *Presidential Address to the Muslim League* (1930)

characteristic marks of the modern age. It is this disparity between the two outlooks on life that is responsible for the present frustration in our time. Is there any way out of it? After the last war (1914-18) several attempts were made to stem this tide of destruction. But because the Western thinkers were not willing to face reality, the formation of a League of Nations could not yield the required security. It was merely the national outlook on a large scale and no approach in the right direction. The real safety for mankind lies only in the direction of a super-national ideal. The present war has again set the people thinking and the first step they seem to take, is in the direction of evolving a federation of different nation-states of Europe, Asia and Africa ultimately to be linked together in a world-federation. After a chequered history of 400 years the Western thinkers have been forced back to the position from where they started. The system of collective security provided by the church organisation was thrown away as a false coin and, after groping in the dark for centuries, have come back to the same position. It is now held that the League of Nations failed because "it left each of its constituent states in unimpaired possession of its individual, sovereign power. They were arbiters of their own destinies, controllers of their own foreign policies, commanders of their own armies, judges

and juries in their own causes. they owed allegiance to no common superior, they recognised no public law to which all must conform, they were subject to no international force to restrain the aggressor and enforce the law. If we are to avoid war, then, these things which were lacking from the League, the common superior, the international law, and international force to back it, are the indispensable safeguards with which we must be provided...Therefore the states of Europe must unite to form a common or federal government...Civilization has reached a point in its development at which the suppression of some at least of the powers of the sovereign states and their transfer to a common superior is a necessary condition of its survival."¹

I do not think that a mere formation of a United States of Europe (U. S. E.), as suggested by Mr. Joad, can resolve the present deadlock created by the glaring disparity between our wisdom how to live peacefully and the attainment of unprecedented control over physical forces of nature. I would rather say that in this project I see the old forces of power politics running riot. Faced with the threatening might of the U.S.S.R., the British people seem to envisage a sort of federated Europe tied to the apron strings of Britain in the role of a superior power and thus retain, if

¹ *Tribune*, Nov. 25, 1945, p. 5. (by C. E. M. Joad)

only for a while, their dominant position in world politics. Can a U. S. of Europe help in reducing the disparity between power and wisdom? Is it not possible that U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and U.S.E., then, plunge the world into another conflagration in pursuance of their own interests? It is not only possible but quite certain, if the events are allowed to run their normal course and nothing is done to revolutionise the basic conceptions of our individual and collective life. It is claimed that each state should voluntarily transfer a part of its sovereignty to the federal centre. But the most important question is: How can this be achieved? If the ideal of territorial nationalism is going to be retained, it is not possible that any nation may surrender her sovereignty to a centre dominated by enemy nationals. A federal centre which accepts the principle of prevalent exclusive national loyalties will fare no better than the discredited League of Nations even if you are to strengthen it with a federal police and military force. So long as the national policy of a state or a group of states is opposed to that of others, no danger of a future war can bring them under one centre. The use of military force for this purpose will recreate the same situation as was witnessed when several members of the League of Nations decided to apply economic sanctions against Italy.

One state after another tried to wriggle out of its pledge when the application of these sanctions began to tell upon their own economic or imperial interests. The only possible solution, therefore, is to rise above our national loyalties and to create a super-national consciousness. It is this ideological outlook alone which can bring all the warring nationalities together at a centre, will cut across countries and races, and differences of colour and languages will pale into insignificance. The enormous power which the development of physical science has placed at the disposal of man shall then be used not for the welfare of one nation at the cost of others but for the welfare of all.

What can be the content of that ideological loyalty? Communism can be said to serve this purpose. Its original appeal is to the people of all the world and unites them without any distinction of country, race, language and colour. But the tragedy is that it does not appeal to the whole man. It claims to serve only his economic necessities and man does not live by bread alone. The only other alternative which can evoke in the people a most universal loyalty is religion. Scientifically interpreted it satisfies all the cravings of man and has the potentiality of creating a harmonious atmosphere for the healthy development of man in his individual as

well as collective life. [But a static religion that bifurcates life into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter, that divides human society into two groups of people, one engaged in their personal salvation with a totally other worldly outlook without exerting any healthy influence on the material pursuits of life while the other group engaged in promoting their self interest without reference to any basic moral law, cannot serve this purpose of unification in human life.] A dynamic religion alone which looks upon spirit and matter, church and state, as organic to one another, can come to our rescue

There will be no distinction of secular and religious and all the multifarious activities of man will be brought under one basic moral law. The conflict between power and wisdom which is in reality the cause of our present deadlock in the world can only be resolved through religion. No doubt, the evolution of society has brought about a complex differentiation of different social functions with the result that science, art, commerce, industry, politics and education, each has carved out a separate sphere for itself, yet this very differentiation puts a greater demand on individuals and societies for greater harmony and unity. This basic demand which is growing ever intenser in the modern differentiated society, requires the services of religion

which is best fitted to fulfil it. This, however, does not mean that we should refuse to admit the autonomy of so-called secular aspects of life. The movement from homogeneity to heterogeneity has been a source of great social progress and humanity has gained much in the growing separation of different activities. Science and art, politics and business, should each be free to follow its own methods and laws; what religion demands is that this differentiation should not be allowed to become absolute separation. It requires that all these so-called secular activities must be pursued under its supreme control. Religion is not, as it is often claimed to-day, one function among many, existing side by side with others on equal terms. It is the whole of life and thus naturally demands that all the different functions which exist in the present complex society, must follow its basic laws that have their source in God Himself. A man may pursue his business but he must do it under the guidance of the moral law. All the material and secular activities are re-interpreted and re-valued. It demands absolute harmony and complete unification of life. "First the natural, then the spiritual and finally the return of the spiritual to the natural that it may unite the natural to itself in holy partnership—thus is the circle of life made complete."

The solution of our problem, therefore, which the differentiation of modern society has raised with its greater power of control over nature as the result of science, lies only in religion. Civilization has advanced beyond recognition but it has brought about with it greater distress, misery, hunger, dissatisfaction, conflicts and revolts. People have become more powerful but less happy and contented. The early confidence which the growth of science and industry engendered in men is fast disappearing. Civilization has proved helpless in bringing peace and happiness. It is at this stage that religion can fulfil its true function. At an early period in human history, when the conflict of civilization and religion demanded resolution, Christianity failed to rise to the occasion. It failed because it refused to accept the force represented by civilization and thus instead of resolving the deadlock simply denied the problem itself. It confined itself to the cultivation of spirit and remained indifferent to body, flesh, matter, civilization and thus gave birth to a dualism which has been the stumbling block not only for religion but for philosophy as well. This Christian dualism of body and mind, forming the mental background of almost all western thinkers and statesmen, mars their political, economic and social outlook. (As long as religion is divorced from its true

function and all the so-called secular activities allowed full and absolute sovereignty within their spheres the present unsatisfactory condition is sure to continue. Bridge the gap and all the insoluble problems vanish into air. Islam, on the other hand, accepted the two conflicting forces and tried to resolve the conflict by bringing a harmony between the two. It, no doubt, emphasises that spirit is more basic of the two but, at the same time, it declares that the affirmation of spirit can be sought, not by renunciation of external forces of flesh or matter, as Christianity has done, but by a proper adjustment of man's relation to these forces. "In Islam the spiritual and the temporal are not two distinct domains and the nature of an act, however secular in its import, is determined by the attitude of mind with which the agent does it. It is the invisible mental background of the act which ultimately determines its character. An act is temporal or profane if it is done in a spirit of detachment from the infinite complexity of life (*i.e.*, religion) behind it; it is spiritual if it is inspired by that complexity."¹

Thus the whole criticism of the Congress leaders against the rise of Muslim nationalism as based on religion is not only perfectly unreasonable but symptomatic of

¹ See the author's *A Study in Iqbal's Philosophy*, pp. 261-264.

a diseased mentality. Though in outward appearance they are engaged in the fight against the political domination of the western nations over Asiatic countries, intellectually they are complete slaves, ready to accept whatever theories are put forth by the Western writers. When nationalism was in the air, they at once began to emulate their masters and now when federation has become the fashion they have taken up the cry without ever considering the implication of any of these. The only motive which can be discerned in their different cries is that of self-interest. They accepted nationalism because it furthered their interest and now they talk of federation of Asiatic nations because in it they see a future prospect of Hindu domination over them. They never realise that a federation of their type does not rise above territorial nationalism which is the root cause of the present crisis in the international field. The Hindu Congress is hardly capable of rising above this limited outlook. The loyalty of its leaders is first and last confined to India and if they look beyond it, it is only in terms of India's greatness. It is the Muslim nation of India alone which, on account of its tradition of more than a thousand years, can give a correct lead to the world. Islam alone is capable of saving humanity at this critical moment.

Circumscribed as we are it is impossible for us to merge ourselves into the whirlpool of destructive nationalistic ideology of the Hindu Congress. The cry of Indian freedom of the Congress pattern may mean expulsion of the Britishers from India but it does not hold out any promise of solving the main problem of the world chaos. A free India would be another factor of disturbance to the already confused balance of world powers, just as a strong militarised Japan, following in the footsteps of aggressive nationalism, contributed not a little to world destruction. If India is to follow Japanese precedent, nationalism ripening into imperialism, as the present policy of the Congress shows, then there can be no moral justification in her demand of freedom. If the history of Brahmanism, with more than a thousand years of imperialistic domination of millions of untouchables and aborigines of India, and as the greatest reactionary force allying itself at every stage with vested interests, can be any pointer, then surely freedom for India would mean slavery for non-Brahmans and non-Hindus worse than the slavery of American negroes and German Jewry. Muslims alone, of all the nations of the world, inspired by a noble extra-territorial idealism, can hope to serve the cause of human peace and stability. In the interest of international co-operation and human

outlook, it is imperative that we must carve out of India a new state based on the progressive and dynamic ideology that is non-racial and non-territorial in outlook and demonstrate to the world the peaceful potentialities of a state based on a moral law of righteousness. In Pakistan alone lies the future destiny of 100 million Muslims of India and of the people of the world.

CHAPTER FOUR

Democracy or Fascism ?

The second characteristic of the Congress pattern of government is democracy. Like the doctrine of nationalism, our Indian patriots have learned the lesson of democracy from the west. A people born and nourished on the socio-religious system of inequity based on the caste distinctions could have no notion of equality and democracy. Economically, the Hindus are capitalists, socially they are conservatives of the worst type and democracy can hardly flourish in such a society. But fortunately for them, the British system of democracy seemed to bring the realization of Hindu Raj nearer and easier. Hindu nationalists adopted it partly because they were ready to accept British-made political theories to look modern and liberal and partly because in it they saw the possibility of permanent domination of the whole of India. But the attitude of the Britishers was strange though it could be justified on the ground of human weakness. Brought up in an environment where representative government of a particular type has been working for centuries peace-

fully and to the advantage of the common man, they could not think of any other form of government suitable for this land. So blinded by this prejudice they tried to impose this particular form on India though the two countries differed in several respects. Thus both the British people and the Hindu nationalists were equally interested in framing the future constitution of India on the pattern of representative government current in England. The Congress, since its start in 1885, has changed beyond recognition but its basic demand has remained the same, a democratic government responsible to the elected representatives of the people and as the Hindus are in the majority, such a government, in actual practice, would be responsible to Hindu people alone. The basic idea which both the British and the Hindu nationalists quite tactily accept and on which the principle of democracy is made to work in other countries, is the principle that a geographical area and a nation should be co-terminus. We have already discussed the hollowness of the principle and the potentiality of serious threat to the future peace of the world inherent in it. Unfortunately, thanks to the ruthless policy of oppression carried out by the British in which they were fully helped by the Hindus, the Muslims of India were totally deprived of economic resources and educational facilities and it was only after a long period of

tribulations that they could realize the direction in which their real genius lay. Even the modified principle of separate electorates—the red rag for Hindu nationalist bull—cannot possibly put a stop to the tyranny of the majority rule which is democracy in a multi-national country like India. Beginning with the highest legislature at the Centre to municipalities and district boards, this form of democracy was introduced. The result was that not only the Hindus—the majority nation—gained in political and economic power skilfully manoeuvring their majorities in these legislative bodies to their own exclusive advantage but they also gradually began to look upon this principle of majority rule as their moral and legal right. While the Muslims, who have been nourished on the principle of equality and brotherhood of man for 1300 years, began to be pessimistic of their future in India. The way the Hindus governed in their majority provinces convinced us once for all that our fears were not unfounded. We felt uneasy and waited for light. To speak out against the democratic form of government meant to go back to autocracy which was none of our liking and yet we could no longer accept a principle which meant our total destruction. The bold leadership of the Qaid-i-Azam saved the situation. On January 19, 1940, he declared that democratic system based on the concept of a homogenous nation as

England, are very definitely not applicable to heterogeneous countries like India. Its imposition on India is *the* disease in our body politic and the root cause of all of India's constitutional ills.

This prophetic lead of Mr. Jinnah, at the most opportune time in our political history, brought us out of the slough of despondency and laid the foundation of our future welfare and stability in India. But it was not possible for us to denounce the principle of democracy outright. Our fight is not against the principle as such as against its applicability in a particular form in a country like India. Free from the innervating influence of Hindu majority at the centre, we shall have to run the government of Pakistan on purely democratic lines. So declares the Qaid-i-Azam: "Democracy is in our blood. It is in our marrows. Only centuries of adverse circumstances have made the circulation of that blood cold. It has got frozen and our arteries are not functioning. But thank God the blood is circulating again thanks to the Muslim League efforts. It (Pakistan) will be people's Government."

But unable to face realities, the Hindu nationalists of the Congress are ready to set aside our demand for a reconsideration of the constitutional reforms *de novo* as smacking too much of an agitational flavour and

are ready to denounce every alternative, however reasonable it may be. "All things considered," it is claimed, "it seems best to nail our flag to the mast of democracy for other courses are fraught with dangers which may rob us not only of democracy but also of the ideal of freedom."¹ Yes, democracy alone, we admit, will give them freedom to establish Hindu Raj in the whole of India. But it is not love for the principle of democracy which forces them to adopt an intransigent attitude against Pakistan: it is their ambition of absolute and totalitarian rule over the whole of India which is being threatened. If democracy is such a noble ideal why are the Hindus not willing to apply it to themselves in social life? How is it that the 60 millions of untouchables are crying for their rights and even Mr. Gandhi is not willing to let them live as they like? We saw above that Dr. Moonje's type of future Indian Government is to be based on the Code of Manu which means denial of democracy, denial of equality and freedom of opportunity. But Hindus of the Congress pattern are not a whit better. Mr. Gandhi once said: "I call myself a Sanatani (orthodox) Hindu because, firstly I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures. Secondly, I believe in the Varnashrama Dharma (the law of the cast-

¹ *The Communal Triangle in India*, p. 229.

system) in its Vedic forms.”¹ These are the lovers of rule of democracy and freedom! As a Hindu writer puts it, “In its details the Hindu social order is simply a menace to freedom, unity and peace. The three thousand and odd castes and the larger number of sub-castes into which the Hindus are irretrievably divided keep nearly 95% of the Hindus in perpetual disgrace and permanently condemned to an inferior social status. People of the lower castes are worse than slaves. The Hindus are not a free people compared with other civilised people of the world ... They stand for inequality, disunion and segregation of caste from caste and of the entire Hindu society from the rest of the world.”² As such, is it not strange that Hindus, of all the people of the world, would proclaim, in season and out of season, that democracy shall be the ruling principle of the future Government of India?

If we analyse the actual working of such a government, we would at once see the hypocrisy of this demand. A state is an organisation which by the use of coercive power controls a particular geographical area and commands the loyalty of the people inhabiting it. A modern free state is one that is based on the principle of sovereignty of the people who, of their

¹ *Young India*, Oct. 12, 1921.

² Swami Dharma Theerthaji *Op. cit.*, p 253.

own accord, delegate the power of government to a select body. It is the essence of democracy that the people are rulers themselves and the state only follows their wishes and enacts laws with their sanction. Theoretically, the position seems an ideal one: for by the identification of government with the governed, sovereignty can be reconciled with liberty. But practically it is not possible for every individual of a State to exercise his control directly on the government and therefore the system of voting is devised whereby they choose people to represent them in the legislative chambers. Again, the actual form which the government of a state takes represents not all the people of a country but only the majority. And it is here where the most objectionable aspect of democracy comes in. Had it implied in practice the government *of the people for the people*, perhaps no body would have raised any objection against it. When put to test democracy comes to mean the government *of the majority, for the majority, by the majority*. In other words, a large proportion of the people of a country are thus totally deprived of their inherent right, under democratic principle, of sovereignty. For all practical purposes the majority is the ruler while minority is the ruled; the laws and enactments of the government in power have a sanction only of the majority.

There can be no country in the world where different groups of people are not found, each group differing from the other in certain respects. Each group has its own interests, ambitions and stakes in the country and the civilisation of a country is nothing but a collective effort of all the different groups composing it. The interests of the one are as vital to it as the interests of the other groups to them and the harmony and peace of a country very much depends upon the accomodating spirit shown by all the groups towards one another. If all the groups are equally represented in the government machinery and show a spirit of compromise and never allow the interest of the country to be dominated by individual group interests, then and then alone is it possible to work the state for the general welfare. But, unfortunately, under democracy, the sovereign power is exclusively handed over to the majority group, and the minority group or groups are totally eliminated. Such democracy is not government of the people but government of the majority over the minority and for the latter it is not a bit different from the absolute rule of a Czar or a Hitler. Democratic government of the majority, in the last analysis, turns out to be an absolute tyrannical rule where a numerically weaker group is thrown at the mercy of the stronger group.

•

The principle of democracy can be applied fruitfully in a country where different groups of people agree on the fundamental principles of life and differ only on the means of achieving it. In such a country it is possible that a minority of today may become majority of tomorrow. The difference about the efficacy of certain means to be adopted for the realisation of a common ideal can be easily overcome. If, at a particular period, the general public is in favour of the programme of one party, it is possible that at another time the people, confronted by a crisis, may change their loyalty to a different programme. In such a state no single party will have the chance of usurping power for ever and flout the opinion of the minority. But in a country like India where groups differ not only on the question of means but equally on fundamental principles of life, it is impossible to run a government on the basis of majority rule: for in such a case the majority of today will be the majority for ever and can very easily disregard the opinion of the minority. Differences of fundamental ideologies, of religion, of culture, of language and of social and moral traditions, are not things to be changed overnight. You can be conservative today and a socialist tomorrow or liberal the other day but it is not possible, so far as human nature goes, to

be a Hindu today, a Christian tomorrow and a Muslim the 'other' day.) In such circumstances, the rule of majority would mean nothing but the rule of our adversaries who would leave no stone unturned in imposing their will on us. For the minority it will not be freedom but enslavement; we would be dethroning the British and enthroning another Nero or a Chengiz.

That these are not mere theoretical fears but actual consequences of the play of democratic principle in India as unrolled before our very eyes during 1935-39 will soon be discussed. Similar sentiments were expressed in the leading article of the *Daily Telegraph* (London), January 3, 1946: "It is difficult to be sanguine about the prospects of forming, as Pt. Nehru has put it, a Central Government representing democratic forces within the country and setting up a Constituent Assembly to frame a constitution that India wants. Such phrases sound well enough but what Pt. Nehru really means by democratic forces within the country is the Congress and what he really means by a constitution that India wants is a constitution that the Congress wants." ¹ Congress democracy is fascism of the worst type. Once Sardar Patel said: "People call me Hitler, but I tell you that Mahatma Gandhi is the

¹ *Tribune*, Jan. 4, 1946, p. 6.

greatest Hitler I have ever seen.”¹ But the clearest confession of Congress fascism is contained in the speech delivered by Seth Govind Dass, the Chairman of the Reception Committee, at the annual session of the Congress at Tripuri. He said, “Our Congress organisation can be compared with the Fascist Party of Italy, the Nazi Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Russia, although they have embraced violence and we are wedded to the creed of non-violence. All the inhabitants of Italy are not Fascists, the entire German public is not Nazi, neither are all Russians Communists; but they have faith in their respective parties. Every Indian is not a four-anna member of the Congress; yet all Indians are with the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi occupies the same position among Congressmen as that held by Mussolini among Fascists, Hitler among Nazis and Stalin among Communists. The Congress, as at present constituted, is the creation of Mahatma Gandhi.”²

To throw millions of non-Hindus of India on the mercy of a caste-ridden Brahman clique with an iniquitous record of blood-curdling atrocities perpetrated for full one thousand years against all out-castes, in the name of democracy, would be the height of folly and a crime against

¹ Muhammad Noman: *Muslim India*, p. 382

² Presidential Address (All-India Muslim League), 1943.

humanity. Most undemocratic of all the people of the world have become enamoured of democracy because it gives them a chance, under the cloak of liberalism and humanitarianism, to bleed all the inhabitants of this sub-continent to their own self-interest. They are more Jewish than the Jews themselves in exacting more than the promised pound of flesh from all the out-castes. Dr. Ambedkar once referred to this characteristic of the Hindu leaders of the Congress which they inherit from their social and religious outlook. "The Congress chooses to forget that Hinduism is a political ideology of the same character as the Fascist or Nazi ideology and is thoroughly anti-democratic. If Hinduism is let loose—which is what Hindu majority means—it will prove a menace to the growth of others who are outside Hinduism and are opposed to Hinduism. This is not the point of view of Muslims alone. It is also the point of view of the Depressed Classes and also of the non-Brahmans."¹

¹ *Dawn*, Jan. 19, 1946. p. 4, col 6.

CHAPTER FIVE

Lesson of History

The peculiar position of India is not without parallel in the annals of history. The period between the two world wars has unrolled before us the great lesson that in all multi-national states, *i. e.* countries inhabited by different nations, the principle of democracy, as the rule of majority, invariably failed to bring about the desired end. Wherever the state was constituted on the basis of national democratic principles, amalgamating peoples differing in religion, race, language or culture and having conflicting ideological attachments, the inevitable result had been tyrannical misuse of power by the majority and the revolt and violent outbursts of the dis-satisfied minority. Many Congress apologists are in the habit of condemning our claim for separation by referring to Ulster but they never care to probe beneath the surface and realise the intensity of freedom urge of the minorities. The conversation that took place between the representative of Ulster and that of the United Ireland, Carson and Redmond, would be illuminating on this point.

Redmond said to Carson, "Ask any safeguards you like for the Protestant minority of Ulster, I am prepared to give them; but let us have a United Ireland under one constitution." Carson's reply was curt and brutal. He replied, "Damn your safeguards; I do not want to be ruled by you."¹ None but this can be the reply of every national minority that differs ideologically from the majority. Whenever this golden principle was forgotten in the emotional upheaval of the freedom movement, the consequences had been most disastrous not only for that minority but also for the world at large.

There was a time when Mr. Nehru referred to the Muslim nation in India with a contemptuous indifference but now he is forced to admit that it exists and is determined to live honourably. But true to the traditions of his Brahman forebears of ancient India, he must try to burke them to death. When it suited him, the nation-state theory of Mill was brought forth as the gospel truth and now when Muslims are claiming a separate national home for themselves on the same grounds, Mr. Nehru comes forward with a new ultra-modern theory which does not confuse the idea of a nation with the idea of a state. The biggest countries of today, it is claimed, are multi-

¹ Presidential Address (All-India Muslim League), 1943.

national.¹ It is the very technique of hypocrisy to shift ground for convenience sake. But we hope to show that there is no iota of moral or historical justification in this new claim of Mr. Nehru. Austria-Hungary was a multi-national state which succeeded only so long as the autocratic power of the tyrant was strong to oppress the people under his heel. It disappeared as soon as the central power weakened and the resultant conflict plunged the world into war. Russia is a multi-national state now but it is a great power only because it is controlled by the iron hand of another tyrant. A federation of free and sovereign nations brought together on some ideological grounds alone can hope to flourish and bring peace to the world.

We shall refer only to two states of Europe, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, constituted after the first world war to prove that multi-national states run on the principle of national democracy must, of necessity, fail to bring about a harmonious growth of different nations constituting it. Take first the case of Czechoslovakia. It was composed of Czechs and Slovaks as the two major nations. The Czechs of Bohemia and the Slovaks of Hungary had not for a thousand years been united with each other, though they were *sister races* and speaking practically the *same language*. But being the

¹ *Tribune*, July 15, 1945, p 12.

common subject of an Imperial power which tyrannised over them without any distinction, they forgot their differences spread over a long period of centuries in the emotional heat of fight for independence. Had they decided to remain apart and retain their nationalities and work on the principle of free and equal partnership, the difficulties that later on embittered their relations might have been avoided. The leaders of the two peoples took a most irrational step and decided to merge one into the other and thus evolve a new nation, Czechoslovak, out of the mutually irreconcilable elements. It was a perfectly new experiment but the world had not to wait for long to see this new beautiful but inherently unstable structure fall to pieces. Why? Only because in a multi-national state it is not politic to introduce the principle of national democracy. They were one and their differences remained submerged so long as the common enemy was there to be fought and defeated; but as soon as that element disappeared, the two people found that there was nothing in common between them. Their dream was shattered.

The Czechs were not only in the majority but were also educationally, financially and politically far advanced. Their nationalism had been much aggressive and in course of time they had developed the non-religious outlook of the age. The Slovaks

were in the minority, being one-third of the Czechs, agriculturists, poor, educationally backward, with no strong and distinct national consciousness and retaining their age-long religious attachment. A particular form of constitution suited to the needs and ideals of the majority was framed and passed. State was to be national, democratic and secular. All instruction and education was vested in the hands of the central authority at Prague. Private educational institutions were permitted only if they fulfilled certain conditions to be laid down by law. Public instruction was to be carried on so as not to be in conflict with scientific research.¹ These provisions clearly implied that the Czechs did not like the religious outlook of the Slovaks and in spite of a specific provision in the Constitution that all religions shall be equal before the law (Art. 124) they were bent upon imposing their own views of so-called liberalism on them under the cloak of scientific outlook which, as they alleged, could not be compatible with the medievalism of Slovak reactionaries. Czech teachers of questionable religious affiliations were sent to teach their children and though the Slovaks insisted on maintaining their own schools wherein to provide religious instruction to their children, the state, *i.e.* the majority, refused to grant any aid to them. Moreover

¹ Art. 19-20 of Czechoslovak Constitution.

President of Czechoslovakia and responsible to the Ruthene Diet.¹ But like the Slovaks the 'poor Ruthenians were doomed to be dis-illusioned. The promised autonomy was never granted and in fact no serious attempt was made to enforce it. In 1920 Ruthenia's main leader who had signed in 1918 the 'Philadelphia Agreement with Masaryk, was made governor of the province with a Czech Vice-Governor, but discouraged by the hesitant attitude of Prague, he resigned in the following year. The process of centralisation was pushed ahead. Czech officials flocked into the country and even Czech colonists benefitted from the Land Reform in place of Ruthene peasants.²

Now take the case of Yugoslavia, a multi-national state formed out of the three different people, called Serbs, Croats and Slovans. A historian, referring to their mutual differences, says, "Here we have confusion worse confounded, wheels within wheels, most admired disorder, a riot of forces working at cross purposes. The Southern Slavs (Jugo-Slavs) had never lived together, had never constituted a state but had been split and shivered into many fragments...They lacked even that primitive unity which is represented by a

¹ Masr, L. P. *The Protection of Minorities*, pp. 44-45

² Hugh Seton-Watson • *Eastern Europe between the Wars* (1918 1944) pp. 171-181.

Hazon, C. D. *Europe Since 1815*, pp. 804 831, Chap. 39.

common oppression.”¹ They professed different religions. The Serbs belonged to the Orthodox Greek Church, the Slovens and Croatians to the Roman Catholic and besides these two there were hundreds of thousands of Muslims. They spoke different languages. Though this difference may be called only of dialect, yet it exercised a certain estranging influence. Moreover, the Serbs and the Croats who almost spoke the same language, wrote it in different scripts. Serbs used the Cyrillic alphabet allied to Greek while the Croatians used Latin characters. But inspite of these radical differences, events led the leaders of the three people to unite. Differences of opinion and policy, conflicts of ideologies and sentiments, melted away and Serbs, Croats and Slovens were fused together in a common patriotism. The questions of religion, language, culture and traditions, which had exercised such a tremendous influence on their lives, were relegated to a subordinate place and being victims of an alien imperialist tyranny they united to wrest power from the rulers. On July 20, 1917, the Manifesto of Corfu was issued. It declares that the Serbs, Croats and Slovens constitute a *single nation* and as such demand independence on the basis of self-determination; the future state shall be a constitutional, democratic an-

¹ Hazon. Op. cit. p. 876-

mentary monarchy; that the United State shall have a flag of its own and that the three constituent members shall all have their own flags as well, which shall rank equally and may be freely hoisted on all occasions; that the 2 alphabets, the Cyrillic and the Latin, shall also rank equally, as shall also the three religions, etc.

After the termination of war, Jugoslavia came into existence in 1920. The enthusiasm generated by the newly acquired freedom dimmed the vision of the leaders. The State was formed in the spirit of the Corfu manifesto. Article 3 of the Constitution reads: "The official language of the State shall be the Serb-Croat-Slovene language." No such language ever existed nor does it exist now. It was but an emotional expression of a united nationalism which circumstances had produced and developed. Soon the whirlwinds of reality brought down the whole structure raised on the shaky foundations of emotional alignments.

The leaders of the biggest party in the Assembly, Serbian Radical Party, had never been able to conceive of the Yugoslav State as any thing but a Greater Serbia while the man, who later rose to the position of the leader of the Croat minority in the Assembly, was the one person who was not in favour of the union of Croatia with Serbia and wanted a separate State for his nation. With such a difference in

outlook it was not possible to work in harmony and co-operation for long. In the Constituent Assembly, inspite of the insistence of the Croats on federalism, the Serbians favoured centralism and, being in the majority, succeeded in imposing their will on the minority. The Constitution was called 'Vidovdan' named after St. Vitus' Day, the Serbian national holiday, on which it was voted. In itself it is insignificant yet it reflects the mentality of the majority party in thrusting its minor cultural associations on the minority which may have some unpleasant associations connected with it.¹

Till 1924 the Croats continued to take part in the government at Belgrade though all this while they were crying against the oppressive policy of the majority. Annoyed at their persistent demand for autonomy and decentralisation some of the Serbs shot their leader in the Parliament who, later on, died in the hospital. At this the Croat members left the House and the deadlock was complete. Hatred grew on both sides. In January 1928, King Alexander called the new Croat leader and asked his terms for acceptance of Jugoslavia and co-operation with Belgrade. The terms

¹ Cf. Congress insistence on *Bande Matram* inspite of its anti-Muslim associations. Recently when the *Jai Hind* cry was feared to replace this notorious song, Mr. Gandhi no time reminding the people that *Bande Matram* nationalism should never be forgotten.

that he put before the King on behalf of the Croat minority are worthy of our deepest consideration. They teach us a lesson of great importance. A national minority that in the heat of struggle for complete independence allows itself to be exploited by the majority is sure to repent but then it is useless to cry when milk is already spilt. He demanded a new constitution, which would reorganise the State on a basis of seven federal units, each to have its legislature *with powers over trade and finance and education*. Each federal unit would control *postal and telegraphic services* on its territory, and would have *its own army*, drawn from men resident in the territory, who were not to be used outside its boundaries without specific approval of the local legislature. The king looked upon these proposals to be tantamount to the disruption of the State and so the legitimate demands of the Croats which they had formulated after a bitter experience of ten years' national democracy, were rejected. But after that Yugoslavia knew no peace and the king had to assume dictatorial powers. Democracy in a multi-national state cannot thrive; it must lead logically either to a fascist dictatorship or its disruption into different national sovereign states.

During the new regime, the Croatians fared no better. The king was bent upon

creating a united nation out of the conflicting medley of nationalities and to develop in the people a new 'Jugoslav patriotism.' As a majority, the Serbs again gained the upper hand and dominated the whole scene while the Croats, on account of their demand for an autonomous State, were cold-shouldered. A few individual Croats came forward to collaborate with the government but they were regarded as traitors by the bulk of people. They represented no one but themselves. The state became definitely anti-Croatian. The advisers of the king were Serbs, all of whom were inspired by a rigidly 'Great Serb' outlook and Yugoslavia for them meant Great Serb State. Demands to become 'Jugoslav' were felt by Croats as demands that they should throw over their whole historical heritage and national consciousness, cease to be Croats and become Serbs, citizens of a centralised Serbian State. The old conception of the 'Jugoslav Idea', as brotherhood of South Slav people with equal rights, began to be forgotten on both sides. The *negative* attitude of the Croats, justified by their experience in the centralised state which was Serbian in form, in spirit and in execution, exasperated the Serbs who regarded Croatia almost as an occupied enemy province. It was felt that only Serbs could be trusted and Serbian officials poured into Croatia. The gendar-

merie, which was composed almost exclusively of Serbs, was increased in number, and often behaved not only tactlessly but cruelly. Croatian peasants were terrorised and robbed. Cases of beating and torture were frequent. The Croats accused the Serbs of exploiting Croatia as a colony.

The situation was allowed to drift till in 1939, with the gloomy prospect of another world-war looming large on the horizon, Regent Paul decided to solve the Croatian question. An agreement was reached on August 26, 1939. A sort of autonomous state was created for the Croats with considerable powers. Now was the turn of the Serbs to clamour for the vindication of their rights and they demanded a separate state for themselves equal in status to the new Croatian state. Gradually the situation worsened and in spite of the dangerous international situation, Croatian speakers made anti-Serbian speeches while inflamed nationalists in Belgrade vehemently attacked the Croats.¹

¹ Hazon : *Op. cit.*, pp. 875-892.

² Hugh Seton-Watson : *Op. cit.*, pp. 217-26, 237-39.

CHAPTER SIX

History Repeats Itself in India

We have followed briefly the course of development of different nationalities as it worked out in the two newly created states of Eastern Europe. In each case the primary motive which led to the amalgamation of conflicting people into a single nation was the ideal of fighting against an alien government for the attainment of freedom. The genius of Czechs and Slovaks, on the one hand, and Croats and Serbs, on the other, demanded a separate state for their full expression but blinded by a temporary zeal and forgetful of historical lesson of the past, they waived aside the demands of prudence and reason. After 20 years of bitter conflict and frustration, during which the minorities passed through a period of worst oppression at the hands of majority in the name of democracy, each nation decided to part company. It eventually led to the virtual dismemberment of the states so fondly raised on an artificially created national spirit. Had the leaders been more realistic and less emotional, they would have set up sovereign autonomous national states linked together

in a sort of confederation evolved on the principle of some ideological loyalty. But most people, in the heat of revolutionary struggle against the foreign power, are often liable to forget these natural lessons but for the minorities it is a question of life and death. In the examples of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the position of Czechs and Serbs is analogous to Hindus in India. Read the Corfu Manifesto of the Yugoslav nationalists and you see the fundamental creed of the Hindu nationalists of the Congress reproduced in every detail. What actually happened after the state was established on the lines of policy enunciated therein, corresponds to what we experienced in India when the Congress attained power (and this power was claimed to be limited and not absolute) in the Hindu majority provinces in 1937. The parallel is quite complete to the very detail. The Slovaks and the Croats who were at first willing to run the new states in co-operation with the Czechs and Serbs, after a period of a few years, began to clamour for separate autonomous states for themselves. The Muslims in India in 1936 were willing to run the provincial portion of the Act 1935 in co-operation with the Congress. The League criticised the Act as totally anti-democratic¹ and denounced the safeguards as making responsible government nugatory. The

¹ Presidential Address (All India Muslim League), 1936.

criticism was calculated to emphasise not the partisan interests of the Muslim community but that "it did not concede full self-government at the Centre Muslim spokesmen betrayed no open anxiety as to the prospect of a Hindu majority at a centre released to a considerable extent from British control. To all appearances, indeed, the Muslim attitude was still what it had been at the Round Table Conference where Mr. Jinnah accepted the principle of an all-India federation, when M. Muhammad Ali intimated that a Hindu majority at the centre would be in some degree offset by Muslim majorities in certain provinces, and when Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan declared that the Muslims had never wished to create an Ulster in India."¹ The manifesto which the League issued prior to provincial elections (1936) was an offer of complete co-operation with the Congress and events in the Assembly Debates during 1935, where Hindus and Muslims successfully co-operated in almost every field against the Government, indicated in which way the wind was blowing so far as the Muslims were concerned.

In the irrational excitement caused by the Muslims' demand for Pakistan, Hindu leaders of the Congress seem to have lost their mental balance. The utterances and threats of Mr. Patel remind us of the

¹ Prof. Coupland : *Indian Politics* (1936-42).

mentality and activities of Hindu Mahasabha leaders during 1928-27 when they secretly organised violent attacks on the Muslims of India in order to demoralise them and thus deprive them of the strength which their struggle against the British during Khilafat days had given them. The most rational attitude would have been to look for the real cause of all this. With such a brilliant start in 1936 it was unimaginable that within a very short period of 4 years the League would declare in 1940 in favour of a total separation and complete autonomy.

The only possible reason is that the heat and emotion of common struggle for political emancipation clouded the vision of the Muslim leaders for a long time. They could not realize in full the implications of their stand on a national democracy in a country like India. The demands of the two conflicting nationalities were crying for adjustment on a different plane than hitherto attempted while the leaders on both sides, blinded to the real situation, tried to solve it from a different angle, tacitly assuming the two people to be a single nation. This attitude was totally destructive of future peace and harmony as it has been in the two states of Eastern Europe. The Hindus being in the majority took full advantage of the situation. The democratic form of government meant rule

of the majority and being fully organised, politically, economically and educationally, like the Czechs, they were bent upon imposing their will upon the minority. It was in reality the consequence of this rule by the mere force of arithmetic that led in each case the oppressed minority to claim sovereign autonomy.

The first step in this direction was taken by Pt. Nehru during the elections (1936). In spite of the offer of co-operation as implied in the Election Manifesto and as practically demonstrated in the Assembly (1935), Mr. Nehru chose to denounce the League without provocation by a rash declaration that there were only two forces in India—the Congress and the British Government. It was an open challenge to the very existence of the Muslims. Mr. Jinnah at once retorted that in spite of the wishful thinking of Mr. Nehru, Muslims constitute the third important factor in Indian politics. Again, in order to win over the sympathy of the Hindus of all classes who, till then, owed allegiance to the Hindu Mahasabha, the Congress adopted a purely communal policy. It did it not reluctantly but with full approval of the majority of the caste Hindus that constitute it. Pt. Nehru is often employed by the Congress High Command for regrouping its shattered forces at every critical moment and, in complete accord with this, he was given a full

attack the solidarity of the Muslims. This unfortunate conversion of the Congress to the Mahasabbhite ideology was resented by the Congressite Muslims¹ who were then sufficiently strong to be reckoned with. But the Hindu leaders seemed to know the trick of placating them. They justified their *volte face* as only a strategic move to tide over an unpleasant situation. Notwithstanding these, the Congress leaders in the U. P. openly spoke of co-operation with the Muslim League in forming ministry in the province.² But when the result of elections was declared in February, 1937, the attitude of the majority completely changed overnight. They realized that power was totally and exclusively theirs for having. A war of nerves was therefore declared to terrorise both the British and the Muslims. Though as a matter of fact the Congress victory was confined to Hindu

alone and its position vis-à-vis Muslims was perfectly unequal to it decided to flout Muslim merely in the

In 1937 the Congress took advantage of its numerical advantage as its first tactical

¹ Mazhar Ali
pp. 137-41.

² Mazhar Ali

³ Congress won
and most of these
Congress got only
Muslims

categorical assurance from the provincial governors that they would not interfere in the day-to-day work of the ministries. It virtually amounted to negative the special powers vested in them by the Instrument of Instruction for the protection of minorities. The acceptance of office by the Congress was made dependent on this assurance. The demand was formulated by Mr. Gandhi himself and, a clever diplomat as he is, he was trying to kill two birds with one stone. This move satisfied that group of the Congress led by Mr. Nehru who during the elections had harped upon the shortcomings of the Act 1935 and had loudly proclaimed that the Congress was fighting the elections to sabotage it. But this demand, if accepted, would equally render all the safeguards, so forcefully fought for during different stages of the Round Table Conferences by Muslims, perfectly ineffective and thus give the Congress Ministers a free hand in launching their destructive programme of liquidating the Muslim Nation of India. The British Government through the Viceroy came to a Gentleman's Agreement with the Congress (July 1937) and thus by a skilful manœuvring the Hindus succeeded in destroying the efficacy of safeguards. This was the first proof provided by the majority at the very start that the fate of Muslims of India was not safe in their hands.

The other side of the campaign against the Muslims was launched by Mr. Nehru at Delhi. Presiding over the Congress Convention (March 19, 1937) he tried to convince the audience that one of the lessons they had learned from the elections was that they had succeeded wherever they had tried to approach the masses directly. On the basis of this lesson he advised the Congress to launch its notorious Muslim Mass Contact movement. But he forgot that the real cause which had helped them in winning over the Hindus *en masse* to the Congress was the adoption of a pure Mahasabha ideology. It was this very move of the Congress which was sufficient to condemn it in the eyes of the Muslims and very soon they were dis-illusioned. Taking full advantage of the propaganda value of the socialistic class-war technique, the leaders of the movement appealed to the economic sense of the Muslims with the intention of driving a wedge into the solidarity of the Muslim Nation and thus to make it ineffective in the political life of the country. But the Congress leaders were destined to meet a disastrous failure of their life and the Muslims soon realised the immensity of danger they were in on account of their disunity. The Congress Mass Contact in 1937 was in reality another attempt at a mass reconversion of the Muslims of India to Hinduism. It was

Mahasabha's campaign of *Shuddhi* in the political garb. The reaction of the Muslims was instant and far-reaching. The whole nation stood up as one man against the Congress and its Hindû leaders were made to realise for the first time that the Muslims were not untouchables who would bid farewell to their religious sentiments for mere crumbs of bread from the new Hindu masters.

Power is often said to corrupt people and in the case of Hindus the limited power which they gained under the Act 1935 corrupted them absolutely. They had secured a definite pledge from the Governors of non-interference and had launched a mass re-conversion movement to terrorise the minority. Being assured of their absolute majority, they began to ride roughshod over the feelings of the Muslims in the matter of formation of ministries. They were ready to throw to the winds all the explicit or implicit pledges which were given to them during the R.T.C. or during the elections. Maulana Muhammad Ali during R.T.C. debates had urged that the representation of Muslims in the Provincial Ministries should be made obligatory by statutory provisions. But the Hindus who were and are even now in the habit of proclaiming at the house tops that the rights of minorities are safe in their hands, forcefully opposed this simple dem

the name of democracy and joint responsibility of the cabinet. "No wise Chief Minister", said Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, "will forget an important minority community." And as later events proved, they were bent upon dishonouring this pledge. In the end, the Hindu opinion prevailed. The representation of minorities in the government was not made a statutory obligation but incorporated in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governors. But the worse was still to come. The language of the Instructions in this respect was so vague that it could be easily ignored and the tactical advantage that the Congress had gained in winning absolute majority on the one hand and in securing a pledge of non-interference from the Governors, on the other, paved the way for their intransigence. As such they refused to come to terms with the Muslim League and went back on their pledge.¹ Though the elections had clearly proved that the Congress was not representative of the Muslims, yet the Hindus insisted that only those Muslims would be included in the Congress Ministries who would betray their party and sign its pledge unconditionally. The Instructions to the Governors referred to the inclusion of only *members* of the minorities but not necessarily their *representatives* and it was very easy

¹ *Iqbal*, July 18, 1937. See Tref Coupland Op. cit.,

for the Hindus to entice a few traitors as it actually did and as it happened in the case of two East European democratic states mentioned above. In the U.P., these broken pledges created a great stir in Muslim League circles. But the unkindest cut of all was that the terms on which the Congress was willing to admit the League nominees in the ministry were offered on behalf of the Congress by the loudly acclaimed Muslim divine, Mr. Abul Kalam Azad. The terms if accepted would have been the death-knell not only of the Muslim League but of the whole of the Muslim Nation in India.¹ This was the second of three acts of treachery perpetrated by Mr. Azad against the Muslims—the first, when he advised the Muslims to merge the whole Khilafat organisation along with its enormous funds into the Congress and thus stultifying their future political development and the third, the Quisling role that he played at the Simla Conference in 1945.

We do not wish to go into detail but it would be illuminating to refer to the case of Orissa. What happened there is sufficient to unfold the real intentions of these so-called champions of minorities. The Muslim population in Orissa is relatively very small and yet as an important minority in the whole of India they hoped, on the basis of pre-election pledges of the Congress

¹ For the terms, see Prof. Coupland : *Op. cit.*, p. 111,

Hindus so freely and indulgently given, to get representation in the ministry. Mr. Jinnah was demanding one third share for the Muslims in the executive of the minority provinces. Unreasonably exasperated by this demand and intoxicated by newly acquired power, the Hindu Command and the Orissa Congress leaders were bent upon giving a practical proof to the minorities that their pressure in this respect, however forceful or unanimous, could not compel the Governor or the Viceroy to go against the advice of the ministers. They wanted to establish a precedent that it was not essential that a Muslim should be included in the ministry of a minority province, the very principle which the Muslims had insisted during the R.T.C. to be made obligatory by statute. As the Governor had pledged not to interfere, the Congress gained its objective and the minorities were sacrificed at the altar of Hindu majority rule.

The rule of democracy triumphed in India just as it had done in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. It proved its utility and vindicated its inviolability by forcing the minorities to demand their separate sovereign states everywhere. In commenting upon this bitter fruit of democracy. Professor Coupland says: "In the first action taken by the Congress leaders under the new Constitution, in their first move in the field

of parliamentary politics, there was nothing of that spirit of compromise without which parliamentary government cannot be expected to work successfully or long. The logic of majority rule was to be strictly enforced.”¹ The way the Congress governments worked in the provincial legislatures confirmed this suspicion. The opinion of the minority was without exception brushed aside as of no importance and their criticism of the government was positively resented. The minorities were made to feel that their criticism was tolerated only on sufferance reminding them of future better days when their very presence in such chambers would be totally eliminated. Congress governments during these twenty seven months were governments by majority rule and by sheer weight of number.

Needless to say that the Qaid-i-Azam was perfectly justified therefore in declaring on January 19, 1940 that the western democracy was totally unsuited for India. But this was, after all, a mere negative attitude. It could not solve the problem of India. Eventually the logic of majority rule led to an equally forceful logic of separate sovereign states for the Muslims of India in the North West and the North East. History vindicated itself in India just as it had done in Eastern European States before.

¹ Op. cit., p. 112.

CHAPTER VII

The Congress Establishes An Inquisition

The future state of India, according to the Congress ideal, would be secular. Much has been written in favour of non-religious nature of the modern state, based on the bitter memories of religious conflicts of Europe. But inspite of this, the position of states in most of the European countries is not secular in the sense of being anti-religious. Some states recognise religious organisations and give them necessary autonomy in their internal affairs particularly in the matter of religious education. In others the secular nature of the state assumes a totally negative attitude. They refuse to accord any official recognition to any religion. People are represented in the state as people and not as followers of different religions and hence they cannot expect any help from the state in the maintenance of religious institution of any kind. This attitude of complete neutrality, however, is often employed to crush the spirit of religious attachment in the people as in Czechoslovakia. There the Czech majority who had in the course of time

imbibed an aggressive anti-religious spirit, decided to pursue a policy whereby to alienate the future generation from any attachment to religion. Education was a central subject and they refused to allow the Slovaks to have any separate and independent schools for the religious education of their children. Thus the secularity of a state can be interpreted in two different ways. In the one case, it is non-religious but not anti-religious and can give perfect freedom to all the religions within its jurisdiction while the attitude of the state is perfectly non-partisan. In the other case, it is, positively anti-religious and adopts a policy which is calculated to inspire in the whole people a positive dislike against religion as such. In the case of Russia this policy takes the form of ruthless persecution of all religions while in the case of Czechoslovakia, a kid-glove policy was adopted by withdrawing all support from institutions even remotely connected with religion and thus allowing them to wither in the course of time. The very purpose for which the state was made secular, *viz.* the avoidance of bloody conflicts on account of religious differences, was frustrated when blood began to be spilt now for a different ideolog, .

So far as the Congress declaration goes it appears that the state would be secular only in the first sense, *i.e.* it would give full

freedom to all religions within India in a totally non-partisan spirit. The Congress resolution on the fundamental rights adopted in 1933 explicitly states that the state shall observe neutrality in regard to all religions and shall accept the right of the people to profess and practise any religion they like. But alongside these declarations which implicitly recognise the existence of different religious institutions within the state, we have Pandit Nehru who, in the words of Prof. Coupland, expounds the political philosophy of the Congress. Quite contrary to the letter and spirit of the Congress resolution he is avowedly anti-religious and feels a sort of pride in condemning religious institutions. "The spectacle of what is called religion, or at any rate organised religions in India and elsewhere has filled me with horror, and I have frequently condemned it and wished to make a clean sweep of it."¹ He is equally suspicious of Islamic culture and laughs at those who talk of preserving it in the modern age. Knowing full well the sentiments of Muslims of India in this respect, that they are very strict in their religious susceptibilities,² he deliberately indulges in such cheap criticism based on a totally misconceived notion of culture. All his attacks are directly against Islam and Muslims and wherever he mentions

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 374

² *Ibid.*, p. 118

Hinduism or Hindu culture that is merely to look non-partisan. The way he deals with religion and culture and the space which he devotes to analysing and criticising only Islamic culture betrays his deep hatred against Islam. The following lines require particular notice. "Those who are desirous of preserving Muslim culture, whatever that may be, need not worry about Hindu culture, but should withstand the giant from the west."¹ This sentence comes from the pen of one who claims to be the enemy of religions of all varieties and yet here he speaks as a partisan, as a follower of Hinduism who advises Muslims that their religion and culture alone is a rotten and obsolete thing which cannot hope to withstand the new forces released by the scientific and industrial development of modern age. At another place he speaks of Hinduism as follows: "It has, indeed, often been remarked that Hinduism is hardly a religion in the usual sense of the word. And, yet, what amazing tenacity it has got, what tremendous power of survival."² The language speaks for itself. He is proud of belonging to such a religion and feels elated at its survival value. When speaking of Islam his language betrays the deep animosity of an adversary. He wishes to see it ended and then to keep up appearances he mentions the words Hindu culture and

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 470. ² *Ibid.*, p. 118.

reading between the lines one can easily see that his venom is directed against the one and not against the other.

But opposed to Mr. Nehru we have Mr. Gandhi who is intensely religious in outlook. In 1920 he wrote, "For me there are not politics but religion. They subserve religion. The politician in me has never dominated a single decision of mine, and if I take part in politics, it is only because politics encircle us today like the coil of a snake, from which one cannot go out, no matter how one tries. In order to wrestle with this snake I have been experimenting with myself and my friends in politics by introducing religion into politics."¹ Similarly in answer to a question Mr. Gandhi said, "I could not be leading a religious life unless I identified myself with the whole of mankind and that I could not do unless I took part in politics. The gamut of man's activities today constitutes an indivisible whole. You cannot divide social, economic, political and purely religious work into water-tight compartments. I do not know any religion apart from human activity. It provides a moral basis to all other activities which they would otherwise lack, reducing life to a maze of sound and fury signifying nothing."²

Bearing in mind the position Mr. Gandhi

¹ Presidential Address (All India Muslim League), 1943.

² Ibid.

holds in the Congress as 'a permanent super-president', it is difficult to appreciate the position of Mr. Nehru. But a deeper study of the *Autobiography* reveals that his relentless crusade against religion begins and ends with the Muslims. When it is the question of Mr. Gandhi he becomes sceptical of his own position and finds ways and means to justify him in his religious approach to politics, in his reactionary role of a capitalist, in his medieval views about industrial revolution, and in his feudal trend of an out-and-out support for anti-democratic rule of the native Rulers of the States.

In 1939, Mr. Kriplani issued a long statement about the policy and programme of the Congress. He says that the Congress is not only a political organisation which wants to free India from a foreign power but also aims to revolutionise our social life in all its aspects. Unlike previous leaders, Mr. Gandhi wants us to base our revolutionary struggle for freedom on a particular philosophy of life which comprehends in itself our social problems, moral values and spiritual outlook so much so that not a single aspect of our life is left beyond its purview. This philosophy which Mr. Gandhi wishes to preach to the people of India is based on two fundamental principles of non-violence and truth and it is not possible to accept the constructive programme or the political technique of the Congress with-

out first believing in them. It should be realised once for all that every scheme of the Congress will be run in future in accordance with the Gandhian principles. It is impossible to work out the Congress programme in the light of a different ideology. Socialism and Gandhism are two different things and have nothing in common and therefore socialists have no room in the Congress. In short the Gandhian philosophy of life is a complete and comprehensive code in itself which can guide the people collectively as well as individually. The principles of Mr. Gandhi and the practical programme of the Congress are two complementary aspects of one thing and are so organically related that ignoring one thing means ignoring one and all. It is only in the light of this ideology that a new system of education is devised. Under this system, children will be trained to grow up, according to a particular pattern, to be members of a new society that is going to be evolved according to Gandhian principles of life.¹

What is this Gandhian philosophy of life? Mr. Kriplani has been very careful in avoiding the use of the word religion though Mr. Gandhi himself does not see any reason for this evasion. After he captured the Congress at Nagpur in 1921 he categorically stated his position. "I call myself a Sanatani Hindu because, firstly I

¹ *Melba*, August 17, 1933. Retranslated from Urdu.

believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures... Secondly, I believe in the Varnashrama Dharma (the law of the caste system) in the Vedic forms. Thirdly, I believe in the protection of cow as an article of faith and fourthly, I do not disbelieve in idol worship.”¹ Thus it is clear that the Gandhian philosophy of life which Mr. Kriplani regards as the basic creed of the Congress, is nothing but the religion of the caste Hindus, and it is the life mission of Mr. Gandhi to propagate it among Indians of all communities through the Congress. The notorious Wardha scheme of education which the Congress ministries thrust on the people in the teeth of opposition from the whole Muslim people of the minority provinces was in the sense of Mr. Kriplani, a first step towards a repatriation of all non-Hindus into the fold of Hinduism and thus usher in, at the earliest possible moment, a golden regime of anti-socialistic Brahman imperialism.

A secular government of Congress pattern, thus, in no way differs from the purely Hindu national government envisaged by the Mahasabha. With the same ideology and the same goal, they are treading apparently two different paths which converge at last at one destination. As such Muslims as a nation can find no room in it. As Mr.

¹ Presidential Address (All-India Muslim League), 1943.

Kriplani himself confesses in the above statement, the policy of political alliances with the Muslims (*e. g.* Lucknow pact of 1916) or the notorious programme of Muslims Mass Contact of 1937 are no solution of Hindu-Muslim problem. The only and surest way of permanent settlement of this problem lies in a total acceptance by the Muslims of Gandhian philosophy of life—in other words, complete and mass reconversion to Hinduism once for all.

We cannot here give a detailed account of the events and occurrences which go to prove the identity of purpose between the two organisations. Yet a study of the educational scheme prepared under the guidance of Mr. Gandhi will be illuminating. It was the first practical step towards the creation of a new generation of Indians who would be able to live according to Gandhian religion and thus bring about a new social order of his pattern. From the very outset the Wardha Scheme was opposed by the Muslims on account of its Hindu communal outlook. A still worse form of it—the *Vidya Mandir*—the very name of which was reminiscent of revivalism—was fought but being in a minority of 3% in C. P. their protests were over-ridden and they could not secure any redress in this respect. The scheme apparently excludes religious instruction and from the point of view of Mr. Gandhi, for whom religion is the very warp and woof

tials they meet in perfect harmony, will help to achieve these objects...Stories of great liberators of mankind and their victories of peace should find prominent place in the curriculum. Emphasis should be laid on lessons drawn from life showing the superiority of non-violence in all its phases and its concomitant virtues over violence, fraud and deceit..."¹

If we analyse these statements we find that the ideal of new education is that children should be taught to look reverentially towards the past history of India which, in other words, would mean nothing more nor less than reverence for the whole Hindu history, religion and culture which go to make up the mental background of every Hindu in India. It may also mean Muslim India of the past. But, as a matter of fact, the emphasis on the principle of non-violence precludes this possibility: for the Muslim period in India means the period of violence rather than non-violence of Hindu type. Similarly the ideal of a united co-operative society is totally impracticable. It is impossible for Hindus, with their rigid caste system, to accept the position of Muslims as honourable members of human brotherhood. For them all but the high castes are lower than animals. Under such conditions the evolution of a united co-operative society may mean a healthy

¹ *H. Mysa*, Dec. 11, 1937, p. 369.

development of their future generation but for non-caste Hindus it can mean nothing but enslavement. Hindus and Muslims are two different nations and as such it is impossible for them to evolve any stable united society. The third important factor in the scheme is the new theory of religion, *viz.*, that all religions of the world are equally true in their essentials and so should be equally respected. This is a sheer untruth. Mr. Gandhi first says that all the so-called differences among religions are due only to their ceremonial aspect or the form of the ritual. But he forgets that these differences in ceremonial observance of different religions do not arise in vacuum but are the external manifestations of the inner meaning and spirit of a particular religion and are as important in developing the collective religious spirit in individuals as the basic principles. To assert that ceremonially religions differ while ethically they are one is perfectly wrong. What is, for instance, common between Islam and Hinduism? Their very conceptions of God and prophets differ, their ideals of future life, of the destiny of individual in this world and hereafter vary, their ethical codes are poles apart. It betrays Mr. Gandhi's ignorance of Islam. Hinduism and Islam stand for two different ideologies and are mutually exclusive in all aspects of human life. According to Mr. Nehru, Hinduism is

not religion in any sense of the term. It is only a socio-political order which embraces within it every form of belief—atheism, nature-worship, snake-worship, idol-worship, mammon-worship, sex-worship. Its rigid caste system alone is responsible for keeping it intact otherwise it would have disappeared from the face of the earth. This medley of irreconcilable beliefs, Mr. Gandhi says, is equal in status with Islam. A horrible blasphemy unworthy of a self-styled saint. The object is clear. The Mahatma is trying to raise the next generation of the Hindus on the idea that their religion has a place of honour among world religions while, as a matter of fact, it would be a sheer travesty of truth to call it by the noble name of religion at all. By the same ugly trick he means to bring down the Muslims of the coming generation to look upon their religion not as the one and only refuge of the miserable humanity craving for peace but as one among many of an equal status. What reason would be there for accepting one and rejecting others? But then he takes the second step. He wishes the children to learn the life of those great men only who followed a particular ideal of non-violence. Thus a child's love for 'victories of peace' would mean his hatred for all those who pursued a different ideology and then he explicitly comes out with his main objective: the superiority of non-violence

over violence and denouncing the latter most unreasonably by bracketing it with fraud and deceit. From a position of equality he raises Hinduism with its basic creed of non-violence to a position of eminence and superiority and degrades Islam to the lowest as a religion of brutes. A system of education for children of all religious communities starts with a purely secular outlook, brings down all religions to a state of equality with Hinduism and in the end denounces all other creeds as inferior and their followers and prophets to be worst sort of people ethically; for, in teaching violence, they were deceitful and fraudulent.

Such is the subtle saintly technique of the capitalist-cum-imperialist clique of Brahman exploiters who are out to enslave 100 million Muslims of India. Spanish Christians established an Inquisition to crush all who did not bow down to it. Indian Brahmans devised Wardha scheme to reconvert all who did not bow down to the dictatorial fiat of a Mahatma.

CHAPTER VIII

Farce Of Fundamental Rights

Inspite of such an array of disconcerting evidence, the Congress still continues to harp on the safeguards. It passed in 1933 a resolution on the Fundamental Rights and then in 1938 declared that "it regards it as its primary duty and fundamental policy to protect the religious, linguistic, cultural and other rights of minorities in India so as to ensure for them in any scheme of Government to which the Congress is a party a wider scope for their development and their participation in the fullest measure in the political, economic and cultural life of the nation." In view of the ideological background of the Congress as enunciated by Mr. Kiplani and Mr. Gandhi and the primary objective to be realised through the Wardha Scheme as analysed above, it is not possible for us to accept this assurance. But to remove the thick veneer of liberality which the Congress leaders and especially Mr. Nehru are so fond of wearing, it is essential for us to assess the true value of the doctrine of Fundamental Rights of Man in the light of modern conception of state in its relation to society.

This doctrine, historically speaking, appeared in Europe at a time when absolutism was the order of the day and law was nothing but the whim of a monarch. He could claim anything from his subjects who enjoyed no rights at all. The aristocracy and the clergy alone, besides the king, enjoyed special privileges. The upper middle class and the bourgeoisie, merchants, lawyers, literary men and manufacturers, were the first to resent this inequality and it were they who developed a new theory of law. They proclaimed that 'law is an expression of the will of the community', and not the mere wish of a monarch and that the divine right of kings should be replaced by the fundamental rights of men as human beings. The society in those days consisted of two different groups, the rulers and the ruled, and by asserting the right of the latter the authority of the government over the people thus became limited. The fundamental background, therefore, of the theory of bill of rights is a mechanical theory of state which looks upon government as existing apart from the governed. It gradually led to an individualistic standpoint, which asserted that the people by a sort of social contract brought the state into being for protecting their individual rights. Beyond those the state has no right to go. An individual's life was broadly divided into two spheres, a p^u c

and a private one. The state was concerned only with the former while the latter was sphere of his fundamental rights where he should be allowed perfect freedom. It served to put a limit to the absolute power of the kings and the aristocracy. A long list of these fundamental rights was drawn up into which we need not go here.

But gradually the form of state underwent a change and monarchies of 17th and 18th centuries gave place to democracy. With the doctrine of popular sovereignty the dualism of rulers and ruled disappeared. The people henceforth became both the rulers and the ruled and it was believed that by this identification of the government with the governed, sovereignty could be reconciled with liberty. As a matter of fact the identification produced quite contrary results. So long as the rulers and the ruled were different the power of sovereignty could be checked and kept under control. But as a result of this masterpiece of political alchemy all limitations on authority became superfluous and henceforth sovereignty became absolute. Divine right of kings disappeared and gave place to divine right of the people. With the disappearance of dualism inherent in a limited form of government, the distinction of public and private aspects of an individual's life equally ceased to operate. When the state is an expression of the will

of the people, there is no necessity of imposing any limit on its activities. These limits were essential when government and governed were two distinct entities opposed to one another but when the coercive power of state came into the hand of the people themselves, there was no reason why they should limit the sphere of government to one aspect of their life. This organic conception of state and society developed along with the growth of democratic spirit. Today the state and society are increasingly being identified. The spheres of state are co-terminus with the spheres of individual life, both private and public. The result is that the modern state, though democratic in form, is totalitarian in spirit. It is the duty of a modern state to provide work for the people, to raise their standard of life, to regulate their wages and weekly hours of work and thus enable them to have leisure. In order to achieve these objects the whole economic life of a country is brought under its control. But the state would be unable to develop on healthy lines in consonance with this spirit if the educational field is left in private hands. So, by the very logic of its spirit, the state controls the whole machinery of education of the people. It plans the whole programme, lays down the policy and chalks out the very details of the scheme on which it wishes the people to develop in accordance with

the basic principles and ideals of the state. Thus the educational scheme of a socialist state would be quite different from that of a capitalist state and in its execution none would brook any opposition from any particular group or groups living within its boundaries. Even in social and cultural affairs the modern state cannot adopt an indifferent attitude or remain a passive observer. For the sake of general welfare it regards its primary duty to evolve a comprehensive scheme and enact laws governing their marriages, their dress, their language, the very script to be used, their mode of living and thinking. In the attainment of these objectives for the good of the people as a whole the state will and does crush any opposition from any group of individuals.

All the constitutions of modern states that were drafted after the first world war explicitly accept this totalitarian spirit in accordance with the organic theory of state and society. The state has a right to expropriate private property with or without compensation or to dispose off forcibly the mechandise of a private tradesman¹; the landed property may be expropriated when required to meet the needs of housing, or for the purpose of land settlement.² Similarly the expropriation of large landed

¹ Cf. Art. 153 of German Constitution (1919); Art. 93 of that of Poland (1921), Art. 103 of Czechoslovakia (1920).

² Art. 155 of Constitution of Reich (1919).

estates and the division of them among those working the land, may be regulated by law. . . . The maximum extent of landed property and the cases in which a maximum holding of land may not be alienated is determined by law.¹ The state has a share in the inheritance of individual property² and even freedom of contract in economic affairs is recognised in so far as it is not opposed to the public interest.³

This development of the doctrine of popular sovereignty has blown to pieces the very conception of limited government of 17th and 18th centuries on which the principle of fundamental rights of man was built. When there is no distinction between private and public life of an individual, when a particular group has no right separate from the right of the whole people constituting the state, there remains no sense in enunciating any fundamental rights of men. Each and every right which the writers of the Enlightenment looked upon as sacred, natural and inalienable are no longer looked upon as such : for the state in the interest of the people claims the right to abrogate any or all of them. But from the way in which democratic principle has actually worked, it is quite evident that it is the majority only which has the right to frame laws and

¹ Art. 43 of Yugoslavia.

² Art. 154 of Reich, Art. 39 of Yugoslavia.

³ Art. 25 of Yugoslavia.

to enforce them and with the coercive power of state in its hands, it can easily tyrannise over the minority. Again, it would be the majority which would be entitled to determine in the last resort which is socially good and bad and in this it would be naturally influenced by its ideological background and its cultural and religious outlook on life. If unfortunately any minority group differs in the fundamental principles of life from the ruling group in a democracy then it is not only possible but certain that the minority will have to forego, one after another, the characteristic features of its national type and merge itself totally into the majority group.

These are not imaginary fears. These are the very lessons of history. Take, for instance, the position of minorities, religious, linguistic or cultural, of Great Britain. The Bill of Rights was passed in that country after a hard and long struggle in 1689. Great Britain consisted of four different countries, England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales with England playing the dominating role and tyrannising over others. Each territorial unit was given the right of self-determination in law. In 1815, in proportion to 489 members returned by England to the House of Commons, Scotland returned 45, Wales 24 and Ireland 100. The single English county of Cornwall returned 41 members while its population was one-eighth

of Scotland which returned only 45. Thus by a subtle device the democratic England managed to secure three times more representation than the total representation of other three 'equal' partners. Though there was absolute religious liberty in Great Britain, so far as the letter of law was concerned, the position of Anglican Church was the most favoured one. No Catholic could be a member of Parliament or hold any office in the state or municipality. The position of the Dissenter was both burdensome and humiliating. He had to pay taxes for the support of the Church of England, though he did not belong to it. He had to register his place of worship with authorities of that Church and could be married only through its clergies. A Roman Catholic could not graduate from Cambridge, could not even enter Oxford, owing to religious tests exacted, which alone Anglicans could meet. The natural result of the supremacy of this religion was that those embraced it who were influenced by self-interest, who were ambitious for political preferment, for social advancement or for an Oxford or Cambridge education for their sons.¹ Thus England by the so-much applauded method of democracy succeeded in annihilating, in the course of years, all the different nationalities that were in the eye of law her equal partners

¹ Hazen : *Op. cit.*, pp. 397-400.

and in creating a 'single unitary nation' to which our Hindu compatriots so fondly refer as the model of pure unadulterated national state that knows no division of religion, language or culture. Perhaps they are launching a similar campaign of non-Hindus into the fold of Hinduism.

Switzerland provides another illuminating example how a majority over-rules and over-powers a minority with a fundamentally different outlook. In 1815 it was a loose confederation of twenty two states or cantons. The confederation consisted of a Diet, which was composed of ambassadors. It was not a federal state but only a confederation of states. The liberalism of the period of so-called Enlightenment which, besides other things, stood for an anti-religious attitude towards life, invaded Switzerland and about 15 cantons out of 22 succumbed to this influence. But this liberal spirit was liberal only in name. In reality it was as totalitarian and hostile in its attitude towards others as any religious fanatic is claimed to be. Thus 15 states by the sheer weight of number began to manoeuvre for gaining a complete control of all the cantons. The remaining seven Catholic cantons, faced with a threat, began to muster their strength for protecting their inherent human right of freedom of

conscience against the invading forces of the Radical Party which claimed to stand for liberty of religion, for a secular education and a lay state. This liberal terminology was a mere euphemism for a total break with religion which the Radicals demanded and the Catholics resisted. The only possible course open to the majority to carry out this programme was to insist on the formation of a strong central government in place of the traditional loose confederation. The seven cantons refused to sign their death warrant. In 1847 a war was declared in which the Catholic cantons were defeated. The Jesuits were expelled and the triumphant Radicals proceeded to carry out their cherished plan of strengthening the federal government. Thus democracy succeeded in crushing the aspirations and will of the minority. If a particular group of people wishes by its free will to educate its children and to govern itself in a particular way, what moral or legal justification has another group to impose its will on it? Is it not the very violation of the spirit of democracy and liberalism in the sacred name of humanitarianism and enlightenment? Substitute India for Switzerland and the Congress for the Radical party and you discover a striking parallelism in the two. The Congress leaders talk in the name of democracy and liberalism and denounce the 'medieval' structure of

society based on a 'reactionary' religious idealism. They advocate in its stead 'modern' society evolved on a 'progressive' philosophy of life thoroughly materialistic

There is no state in Europe whose constitution does not contain a comprehensive list of these fundamental rights of man and nowhere has these provisions protected a minority from the tyranny of the majority. Everywhere a democratic national state was evolved out of a conglomeration of different units, with an ample assurance for the protection of their inalienable and sacred rights, but in every instance where the minority differed from the majority in regard to religion, race or language, the latter invariably tried to destroy the distinct nationality of the former and thus to absorb it or to tyrannise over it and crush its self consciousness by the coercive power of the state. When the Croatian minority of Yugoslavia demanded autonomy—a right promised them by the Constitution—the Serbian majority replied "Serbs, Croats and Slovenes are in reality one nation. It was the foreign imperialism which had kept them divided. Now when the foreign yoke has been removed, the consciousness of national unity has emerged successful and has broken down all the artificial barriers of language, religion and political institutions. To maintain and develop this consciousness of unity it is necessary to

abolish the old geographical divisions which the foreign power had exploited to divide the nation in its own interest. The provincial boundaries should be re-adjusted for local administrative purposes so that the old provincial divisions may not lead to the formation of racial groups." It is Pandit Jawahar Lal speaking to Indian Muslims. How marvellously similar the language is and how universal is the spirit of tyranny inherent in the very ideal of European democracy and nationalism.

Recently the Congress leaders have come out with another fundamental right to give us further assurance of their good faith, viz, the right of self-determination. They seem to forget the long history of broken pledges and ~~discontinued~~ promises which characterised the Congress regime of twenty seven months. ~~We are a nation~~ in this sub-continent and we demand by the right of nationhood a separate state in our homelands, ~~autonomous~~ and sovereign. That was the real interpretation of the doctrine as advocated by President Wilson during the first world war. But the Congress distorts it by adding its own qualifying phrases and thus takes away with the other hand what it so magnanimously seems to give with the one. It is its old technique to cloak its imperial lust for power under the fair name of liberalism. The right of self-determination in the Congress sense

'means only the right' of different territorial units to be free within their geographical limits but still bound to the apron strings of a Hindu dominated centre. Taking the Punjab as a unit, for instance, the Congress says that its inhabitants, Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims and others, have a right to evolve their provincial government as they may collectively like. But this was given to us by Provincial Autonomy and still it could not satisfy us. It was in reality this provincial aspect of the Act 1935 which convinced us that the Muslims of India cannot work out their destiny in this country according to their genius in a joint central government under a democratic principle which gives the Hindus absolute power to squeeze life out of us. The totalitarian state of the Congress' may adjust the provincial boundaries of different units on the plea of administrative convenience so as to reduce the Muslims of the Punjab and Bengal to a minority status. Peaceful penetration of Sind, Frontier and Baluchistan by the Hindus, which is already in full swing, may soon undermine the solid Muslim majority of these areas. What will remain of the right of territorial self-determination? We want to exercise this right as a nation and wish to determine our future destiny ourselves in the land of our birth. With deep ideological differences between the two peoples, it is humanly

impossible for us to lead a free and independent life under the cramping tyranny of the native imperialists. A nation of 100 million people of India cannot be made to resign itself, and that willingly, to a life of eternal serfdom and abject slavery. Pakistan alone as a truly democratic sovereign state in the north west and north east of India can afford us a chance to grow to our full manhood. To deny us this right would be a crime of unparalleled magnitude. Without Pakistan the problem of India will remain unsolved for ever and a discontented India shall be the greatest plague-spot in the world. In the interest of international peace and accord, economic prosperity and human brotherhood, 100 million Muslims of India must have an honourable place under the sun.

CHAPTER NINE

Why Pakistan ?

We have surveyed the whole position and analysed the basic ideology of the Congress. Pt. Nehru often appeals to Muslims to join the Congress and then mould it as they like. Once at Lahore he declared that the Congress was a political body whose doors were open to all without any distinction of creed or caste. Theoretically the position is sound but the actual working and the peculiar condition of the country make it practically impossible. No doubt the Congress is run democratically and every group can gain power provided it attains majority. It is equally possible that a coalition of two numerically weaker groups may get the reins of power in opposition to another group which may be singly in a majority. But in the consideration of all these possibilities, one important fact is often forgotten. In England the members of the Parliament all belong to a homogeneous group agreeing to a great extent in the fundamental principles of life, in their cultural and religious ideals, in their ethical outlook. The parties are based on the differences of means and method for

achieving one and the same object. In such circumstances coalitions are possible and the majority of today can become minority of tomorrow. But in India the position is quite different. The Muslims are a 'national' minority with which no party of the majority, true to its national spirit, will ever be ready to form a coalition. The formation of ministries in 1937 is a clear pointer in this direction. The Congress stands for the liquidation of Muslims as Muslims: it is ready to absorb them only if they are willing to be proselytised. The Irish were a national minority in the British Parliament after 1801. Theoretically the Irish members (after 1829, when Catholics were allowed to sit in the House of Commons) were not debarred from forming a coalition and thus attain power. But it never could happen. Liberals succeeded Conservatives and Conservatives made room for Labour but Irish members were nowhere in the picture. Their presence in the House could be of no help to their country. The fiery oratory and matchless leadership of O'Connell and unique parliamentary experience of Farnell could not bring them nearer the goal. For a century they fought but fought in vain till they decided to carry on this warfare outside the House. The modern Eire of De Valera is not the result of constitutional fight within the House but a revolutionary struggle of

people outside. In Czechoslovakia, the Slovaks and Germans were singly in a minority but could have easily become a majority against the Czechs had they coalesced. But the Czechs could not allow this to happen and so the Slovaks could never get any effective voice in the executive machinery of the government. No constitutional manoeuvring could make the Croats and Slovenes of Yugoslavia a majority against the Serbs. Similarly in U. S. A. the government may be in the hands of Republicans or Democrats but never in its history of 200 years had the negroes any chance of rising to power nor will they ever get it. Thus not only is it not possible for us to achieve any dominant voice in the Congress so far as we are what we are, but there is every chance of our losing the very identity of being Muslims by joining it. So if we are to retain our self-consciousness and if we are bent upon solving the problem of India's future to our satisfaction, it is imperative that we should strengthen the Muslim League by our money, our time and our blood. It is the symbol of our life, our honour, of our future well-being in this country.

Another remedy suggested by some people to solve this is socialism. The foremost advocate of this type of solution in India is Mr. Nehru. After denouncing organised religion as the greatest 'reaction-

'ary' force in the modern world, he is led to the only possible solution—"the establishment of the socialistic order, first within national boundaries, and eventually in the world as a whole."¹ This new order he wishes to establish by use of force and coercion. "The present conflict in society, national as well as class conflicts, can never be resolved except by coercion. Conversion, of course, there must be on a large scale, for so long as large numbers are not converted there can be no real basis for a movement of social change. But coercion over some will follow."² In the light of these passages we see the future programme of Mr. Nehru in a cut and dried form. The first stage is the formation of a 'national' government, wherein the distinctions of religions will be totally eliminated. Muslims will be members of this state as individuals and not as Muslims. The second stage will be to convert a major portion of the people to a socialistic programme which would be totally anti-religious. Lastly, the resisting minority, who would be unwilling to submit, shall be coerced, in the very name of democracy, to accept this new order. This scheme was first put down in black and white in 1935 and after two years the experiment started. In 1937 the first step towards the formation of a 'national' government was taken in accepting office in

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 523. ² *Ibid*, p. 551.

several provinces of India. Along with it, in the same year, was launched the Muslim Mass Contact movement, the second step. This was run under the direct guidance and control of Mr. Nehru. Men like Dr. K. M. Ashraf, Mr. Rizvi and Munshi Ahmad Din were appointed to propagate the ideal of Marxian socialism with particular emphasis on class war. As soon as the Congress ministries were strongly saddled in power, the third item of the programme was launched. A reign of terror and intimidation, murder, loot and arson—the severest form of coercion—was set afoot against the Muslims.

But does the Congress stand for a socialistic revolution in India? An answer to this question is not far to seek. Mr. Kriplani, in expounding the Gandhian philosophy of life which is the very core of present Congress social programme, unequivocally says that socialism is totally against it and perfectly unsuited to the genius of Indian people. Mr. Nehru himself admits that the promise of socialism holds no attraction for Mr. Gandhi and that for him a capitalist is nothing but a trustee of wealth.¹ At Haripura, Sardar Patel addressing the Congress Socialist Party, said, “You are responsible for dividing the Congress into Left and Right although it had been always a unity. . . We have been tolerating

¹ Op. cit., pp. 517-18. See also *Times*, Dec. 27, 1915, p. 5.

you for the last two years, but the time has come when you shall no longer be tolerated.”¹ Socialism was useful so long as the Congress was fighting to gain power. Militant socialism has a propaganda value, and class-war as a basis of workers’ unity and workers’ front has been fully exploited by all socialist parties of the world and so did the Congress in India. But as soon as it attained its objective, socialism was cast away as a false coin. The labourers had begun to raise their head and the Communists were fully exploiting them for their interest just as the Congress had done before. The coercive forces of police *lathi* charge and military firing were being freely employed. The Congress Ministry of Madras was forced to remind the people that the socialistic philosophy and programme were contrary to the spirit of Indian culture and traditions and advised them not to be influenced by such a ‘reactionary’ movement.² But it is almost unbelievable that what is being condemned here as totally anti-Indian in spirit is held up as the *sine qua non* of modernism for the Muslims. The programme of the Communist party which Mr. Rajagopalachariar’s government deemed it proper to condemn, was the same which Dr. Ashraf and Munshi Ahmad Din propagated as the official policy of the

¹ *Times of India*, Feb. 22, 1938.

² *Haricen*, Aug. 20, 1938.

Congress through its Muslim Mass Contact platform in the same year. Presiding over a meeting of 'Nationalist' Muslims of Bengal, Mr. Subhas Bose said: "To popularise the Congress ideal among Muslims an economic programme is indispensable. This programme should be so formulated as to appeal to the masses and labourers."¹ Why is this discrepancy? How is this inconsistency in the Congress attitude towards the Hindus and Muslims to be explained?

The answer lies in the dual policy of the Congress. So far as the Hindus are concerned, it aims at uniting them on a common platform. And as nothing can help in the attainment of this objective more than the dynamic force of religion, Mr. Gandhi has specialised in mahatmic technique. He goes from one place to the other infusing into the Hindus a purified religious spirit and emphasising the value of mass prayers and hymns. He is the chief exponent of the movement of revivalism that is bringing Hindus of different shades of opinion on one platform. His network of Harijan Sewak Sanghs is equally calculated to strengthen the solidarity of his class and by his notorious fast-unto-death he succeeded in retaining 60 million untouchables within the fold of Hinduism. So far as the Muslims are concerned, by the same logic, the Congress is trying to weaken their solidarity

¹ *Assembled C.P.*, Aug. 13, 1938. Retranslated from Urdu.

by weaning them away from their religious idealism through an appeal to their economic sense. This duty is undertaken by Mr. Nehru who goes from one place to another crusading against religion and eulogising socialistic revolution. To him the idea of a Muslim nation being based on religion is reactionary and medieval and division of society on economic lines alone modern and progressive.

Now let us analyse the significance of this class-war and of alignment of parties on economic basis so far as the Muslims are concerned. By an appeal to economic sense, the solidarity of the Muslim society would be 'thoroughly weakened. The fundamental principles on which this society is raised and which keeps it united inspite of differences of language, colour, race and countries, are ideological and religious. All those who believe in the unity of God and the finality of prophethood as understood by the Quran, become equal members of a single body-politic. In it the rich can participate as well as the poor: for ideological attachment cuts across economic interests just as it destroys racial or territorial loyalties. On the basis of this dynamic attachment they meet on a common platform in all social and economic functions. If socialistic principle of class-war were to succeed, it would mean the break-up of this unity. It would

into different classes and incite members of one class to wage a relentless war against the other, which means that they would no longer be members of the same social unit. Socially they would be unable to meet on a common ground and religiously there would be no possibility of mutual give and take. Two classes of people who are fighting each other for bread and butter cannot meet together in the mosque nor a rich Muslim can, in these circumstances, pay *zalat* to his poor brethren; for he would have no justification to call a man his brother who is ready, on his very principles, to fly at his throat at the first opportunity. All the ties that bind one Muslim to others will be one by one broken and gradually he will be led away from the main springs of social influence. The lower strata of society directly or indirectly derives all knowledge of religion and culture from the middle classes and the most fatal result of this class war would be to prevent the poorer people from getting a constant flow of religious and cultural inspiration and thus make them safe for atheism. Gradually but surely the economic class conflict would end in the division of Islamic society into warring groups, each attacking the other with the active alliance and help of non-Muslim groups and thus within a few decades Islam as an independent social and moral philosophy would disappear from

India to the satisfaction of the votaries of Brahmanism.

For a long time the Congress contrived by one device or other to drive a wedge into the Muslims and could succeed to some extent by supporting the 'Nationalist' Muslims out of all proportion to their importance. So long as there was a chance of utilising the services of some misguided people, the Congress could hope to use them to divide the ranks of the Muslims. But when the Muslim masses of India showed unmistakably in recent elections which way their sympathies lay, the Congress leaders received a shock of their life. The League has now seriously entered the field challenging their claims and so these well-wishers of 100 million Muslims of India are forced to re-consider the line of attack. Previously Mr. Nehru was left alone to indulge in meaningless oratories about socialist revolution. But he was in the eyes of the senior Congress leaders a mere toy to be played with. With the emergence of the Muslim League as the strongest party representing the whole Muslim Nation of India, they literally felt the ground under their feet slipping. The diplomat Mr. Gandhi is now willing to address Congress workers as Hindus and advises them to cultivate friendly relations with Muslims as their own kith and kin. Sardar Patel, the Indian 'Musso', loses his ba as a

into different classes and incite members of one class to wage a relentless war against the other, which means that they would no longer be members of the same social unit. Socially they would be unable to meet on a common ground and religiously there would be no possibility of mutual give and take. Two classes of people who are fighting each other for bread and butter cannot meet together in the mosque nor a rich Muslim can, in these circumstances, pay *zalat* to his poor brethren; for he would have no justification to call a man his brother who is ready, on his very principles, to fly at his throat at the first opportunity. All the ties that bind one Muslim to others will be one by one broken and gradually he will be led away from the main springs of social influence. The lower strata of society directly or indirectly derives all knowledge of religion and culture from the middle classes and the most fatal result of this class war would be to prevent the poorer people from getting a constant flow of religious and cultural inspiration and thus make them safe for atheism. Gradually but surely the economic class conflict would end in the division of Islamic society into warring groups, each attacking the other with the active alliance and help of non-Muslim groups and thus within a few decades Islam as an independent social and moral philosophy would disappear from

India to the satisfaction of the votaries of Brahmanism.

For a long time the Congress contrived by one device or other to drive a wedge into the Muslims and could succeed to some extent by supporting the 'Nationalist' Muslims out of all proportion to their importance. So long as there was a chance of utilising the services of some misguided people, the Congress could hope to use them to divide the ranks of the Muslims. But when the Muslim masses of India showed unmistakably in recent elections which way their sympathies lay, the Congress leaders received a shock of their life. The League has now seriously entered the field challenging their claims and so these well-wishers of 100 million Muslims of India are forced to re-consider the line of attack. Previously Mr. Nehru was left alone to indulge in meaningless oratories about socialist revolution. But he was in the eyes of the senior Congress leaders a mere toy to be played with. With the emergence of the Muslim League as the strongest party representing the whole Muslim Nation of India, they literally felt the ground under their feet slipping. The diplomat Mr. Gandhi is now willing to address Congress workers as Hindus and advises them to cultivate friendly relations with Muslims as their own kith and kin. Sardar Patel, the Indian 'Musso', loses his balance of mind and as a

typical Brahman imperialist, threatens the Muslims with a civil war. But like his bragging prototype he is sure to meet his Waterloo very soon. Incitement to violence so soon after re-affirming faith in non-violence (but that was in reality to remove the frown of the white master) was nothing strange for us, for know the dual role of hypocrisy and cowardliness which is the characteristic of present Congress leadership. Mr. C.R. alone, out of this hotch-potch of mediocrity, is able to retain his cool judgment, brilliant forethought and penetrating insight. He acts boldly and firmly. Just as previously he rose to the occasion by dissociating himself from the fatal policy of the notorious August rebellion, so at this time also he is the first in the field with a constructive proposal. But as his 'formula' was cleverly devised to offer us a mutilated autonomy in the name of Pakistan similarly now he comes forward with a new 'formula' for resolving the deadlock. With his break with the Congress on our behalf he seemed to be our champion but turned out to be as good our enemy as any body else, so now by his new principle he is following the old policy of prescribing a sugar-coated poison to us. He comes forward with the new testament *that socialism alone can save the situation.* The Muslim League has succeeded in uniting the Muslims on an unprecedented scale and therefore the only course for Hindus to

nullify the effect of this is to preach socialism. Mr. Brij Narain has taken up the call of Mr. C. R. and has clarified the whole issue. After socialism Muslims will cease to be Muslims and the Indian problem would henceforth be not Hindu-Muslim problem but only Hindu problem. He says: "Is there room for a political party in India which would steer clear of religion and take its stand on purely economic issues? Socialism can produce such a party and socialism may unite the masses of India whom religion has hopelessly divided." Referring to the Russian sponsored revolt in Azerbaijan against Persian Government, motivated solely for imperialist purposes of expansion, which Mr. Brij Narain seems to extol, he says: "Russian socialism means some thing for the down-trodden rural proletariat in Persia; for the sake of bread and human conditions of living the Muslim proletariat allies itself with Godless Russia against the Muslim rulers of Persia. Here is an example of how economics overrides religion, how economic issues when explained clearly to the masses, dissolve religious bonds."¹ We do not wish to quarrel with the author for the view he holds. What we want to emphasise is that the Hindus advocate socialism only, because it well help in liquidating Muslim socie from India and thus making India safe

¹ *Tribune*, Jan. 9, 1946, pp. 5, 8.

Hindu Raj.

All lines of approach, therefore, lead us to the same conclusion that if present situation in India is allowed to proceed on the pattern which has been formed by the British, it would mean ruin and disaster for us. But we cannot remain for long in such a negative position, refusing to share in the national consciousness of the Hindus, in the democratising of social and political institutions of the country. We are to live here and partake of the good or ill fortune that befalls our fellow inhabitants of this land. The question of Hindu-Muslim relation which has assumed greater pre-eminence due to the emergence of Muslim League as the sole representative of the Indian Muslims, should not be interpreted in the light of war and strife: for it is impossible for the two people to live together and yet to keep themselves constantly at daggers drawn. We shall have to come to friendly terms. There can be no question of civil war, violent or non-violent. We must put down with determination such hostile outbreaks. Nor is this problem to be interpreted as the desire of Muslims for a government other than democracy. It is only a misconceived and mischievous propaganda by Hindus that we are opposed to the spirit of democracy. No right thinking person can ever conceive of returning to the obsolete forms of absolutism

or aristocracy. The form of democracy that has been reproduced in this country on a totally wrong supposition that Indians are one nation has perfectly no justification and our opposition to it should not be misconstrued to mean opposition to the spirit of democracy. The British people are temperamentally conservative and it is hard for them to conceive any democratic form of government different from their own while the Hindus motivated by their self-interest refuse to appreciate the predicament of the Muslims who are deprived of the right of popular sovereignty in this vicious form of government. They see in it a chance of future aggrandisement. Thus both the British and the Hindus are agreed on this—the British due to the natural weakness of their national character and the Hindus due to their self-interest. Their conflict arises only because the latter wish to reach the goal set before them faster while the British due to their imperial interests proceed cautiously and under duress. But our position in this triangular fight is peculiar. We are the loser in this battle. Whatever attitude we may adopt, of plunging into the battlefield against the British on the side of the Hindus or otherwise, we cannot extricate ourselves from the vicious circle. Being a minority, we cannot claim our rights and even if we do of them, we feel that we cannot

for the form of government that is going to be enforced in this country gives everything to the majority and nothing to the minority. With every constitutional progress we shall be gradually receding into the background till there will be no alternative for us except to die as a nation in this country.

Thus the only rational attitude under the circumstances is that we must carve out our destiny in this country quite independently, unhindered by the weight of the Hindu majority and in accordance with the spirit and genius of our people. We are a separate nation that derives its inspiration from a peculiar moral and cultural ideology which differs in most vital respects from the cultural and moral ideology of the Hindus. Even in such matters as education we cannot accept their lead. No doubt, to a certain extent, there may be many things common in the two types of educational planning. Removal of illiteracy, making education practically useful and planning it according to modern psychological researches would be acceptable to all. But our agreement begins and ends there. The basic principle which runs throughout the educational scheme of a nation depends upon and derives its inspiration from, the peculiar national type of a people. We want our coming generation to develop along certain definite lines. Ideal of life, the nature of

mental make-up, formation of character, habits and outlook of a Muslim child would be different from those of a Hindu child and thus, of necessity, the educational scheme that would be devised for the sake of the latter can hardly be congenial to the former. We do wish that Hindus and Muslims should live together peacefully and work together, so far as possible, for the common welfare but that does not mean that we should, for that purpose, forego our national type and destroy our ideological attachments. Similarly in other spheres of life our problems are different and wherever the problems are the same the modes of solving them are essentially at variance. When we refuse to subscribe to their socialistic programme, however superficial it may be, the reason is not that we are blind to the acuteness of the economic problems of the day. We believe that given a free atmosphere in which to display our talent according to our genius, we can successfully cope with the problem of poverty in all its forms. There is a world of difference between our economic outlook and that of the Hindus or the westerners. So it is impossible for us to be moved by their appeals. We do wish and need a social and economic revolution but it will be acceptable to us only if it is carried out in consonance with our ideological outlook on life.

Cultural development is "

sary but we are averse to the transplantation of a foreign seed to our soil. In such circumstances the superficial remarks of Mr Nehru that instead of minor issues of Pakistan we should think of planning and increasing the resources and of the removal of unemployment,¹ are in reality putting the cart before the horse. The Hindus can engage in economic planning, for the present form of government gives them power and the necessary freedom to think in terms of constructive work. For us, on the other hand, the problem is still of gaining power and freedom of environment. Unless we achieve that it is impossible for us to look seriously to any other thing. If educational efficiency and economic prosperity had been possible under untoward circumstances of slavery, no people would have ever risen in revolt against political bondage. A nation demands freedom, sacrifices everything for it and undergoes grimmest ordeals only because it can grow to its stature in a free atmosphere. We want that freedom and we are striving for it. That freedom is possible only in Pakistan, sovereign states, where the Muslims are in a majority and free to work out a comprehensive programme of educational and economic reconstruction in the light of their sociological ideals of society. At another place Mr Nehru says:

¹ *Tribune*, Aug 27, 1945, p. 1

"The day of national cultures is rapidly passing and the world is becoming one cultural unit. Nations may retain, and will retain, for a long time much that is peculiar to them but the machine age and science, with swift travel, constant supply of world news, radio, cinema, etc., will make them more and more uniform. No one can fight against this inevitable tendency.....The real struggle today in India is not between Hindu culture and Muslim culture, but between these two and the conquering scientific culture of modern civilisation. Those who are desirous of preserving Muslim culture.....should withstand the giant from the west. I have no doubt, personally, that all efforts, Hindu or Muslim, to oppose modern scientific and industrial civilisation are doomed to failure, and I shall watch this failure without regret."¹ This passage betrays worst example of slave mentality. Being blinded by the superficial glamour of western culture Mr. Nehru is striking a note of dishonourable retreat. He wishes us all to identify ourselves with it. But he still seems to live in the optimistic age of the nineteenth century. The destructive forces released by the inherent weakness of this culture have set modern thinkers to reconsider the whole problem of social construction on a new basis. W. McDougall, C.E.M. Joad, Alfred Cobban and a host

¹ *Autobiography*, pp, 469-70.

of other scholars are trying to rebuild western society on a more humane outlook while Mr. Nehru wishes us to go back to the age of inhuman materialism.

No doubt this culture has spread all over the world cutting across every barrier but it succeeded in achieving this position thanks to scientific progress and political ascendancy and not on any inherent merits. As a matter of fact the spirit underlying this new culture and the shape it has taken are alien to the real yearnings of human nature. The universal feeling of disillusionment and frustration that is on the increase among all people of the world, is the surest sign of its weakness and has, of necessity, given rise to an unqualified pessimism in the heart of most people. A modern sociological writer begins his book thus: "There is a race of animals called the lemmings. It is said that at certain times, stricken with madness or the call of ancestral memory, they gather in large bodies and rush wildly and irresistibly, disregarding all obstacles, to their common destruction in the sea. The behaviour of the human race, as history records it, sometimes seems to parallel that of the lemmings."¹ This confession of utter pessimism as to the future destiny of present civilisation shows the intensity of the crisis through which the modern world

¹ Alfred Cobban - *Origins of Collectivism* (1911),

is passing. We are not unconscious of it. We do not wish to close our eyes to its destructive potentialities. It is this realisation that makes us all the more determined to establish our free home in Pakistan. We have a destiny and a mission. We possess a code of laws that can help the modern suffering world. Socialism was tried and was found wanting in the scale. Russia experimented with it and the world expected a miracle. But she decided to follow the path of the Czars. Socialism of Stalin proved not a whit better than the imperialism of his predecessors. It has failed. Now is a chance for us to prove that the ultimate peace and prosperity of human race lies only in Islam. Given a free home of Pakistan we can hope to work out its social and economic system to its logical end. If the western culture can attain universality through science and lead humanity to nothing but destruction, we are sure that, with the help of power one can gain through the exploitation of natural forces, our culture can be better successful and in the end become equally universal without bringing in misery, class-war, poverty, pestilence, hatred and total annihilation of the human race. Pakistan stands out boldly as a symbol of our aspirations towards the ideals of universal peace, human brotherhood and equality of opportunity for all. As a minority in

India we are a mere drop in the wide ocean. A united India may be a great power, may expand its empire beyond its natural boundaries as other great countries under the surge of nationalism have done. But this prospect does not appeal to our sentiments. We shall be as good slaves in a united India as, for instance, Negroes are in America. Our existence as a dissatisfied minority here would add to the already serious crisis of the world. The way of peace lies only in Pakistan: only if we are free to work out our destiny in a part of India where we can live and grow without fear of molestation by a hostile majority. We shall put our weight on the side of democracy, brotherhood of man and federation of free nations bound together not by ties of self-interest and power politics but by the stronger alliance of ideological attachment that does away with the artificial limitations of race, colour, language and geography.

Our future destiny in India depends upon the strength that we can muster as a united nation. We are placed between two different hostile forces—the British and the Hindus. We shall have to fight with both. But this fight is not going to be on a material or economic plane, a fight for jobs, for loaves of offices, for representation in services, to be fought with destructive weapons of modern civilisation. It shall

be a cultural and ideological battle. We represent in our person an ideal of social and cultural reform which is diametrically opposed to both these. After centuries of neglect its sources dried and it withered before the rising tide of western civilisation and culture. For several years we tried to resist it with almost no resource at our disposal and at a time when we were materially and intellectually a bankrupt people. The result was a foregone conclusion. After a struggle of seventy years we had to lay down arms before a power superior to us in material resources and moral earnestness. Then we decided to adapt ourselves to the new force while determined to retain our national type. But with the passage of time we realised that it was impossible to continue on our journey with one foot towards the east and other to the west. The educational programme which the rulers imposed on us changed our outlook on life and instead of helping in strengthening our bonds, served to disrupt the already tottering structure of our society in India. Since 1935 we are face to face with an equally strong and hostile force represented by Hinduism. It is spreading its net around us just as the British power did. But the experience that we gained after an unsuccessful struggle of 180 years has taught us the bitter lesson that if we are to

live here and preserve our national type with its characteristic cultural and social outlook, we will have to carve out of India a separate Homeland for our nation, where we can lead a life of honour, peace and prosperity in accordance with our cultural heritage.

Pakistan is, thus, not only to be the embodiment of our ideal of a future state based on the laws of justice, equality and human brotherhood but also the logical consequence of our struggle against the forces of two alien cultures under which we cannot hope to thrive and grow to our full manhood if we are to retain our self-consciousness. It shall be the realization of the dream that Sultan Tippu in the south and Syed Ahmad Shahid in the North dreamed and for the attainment of which they laid down their lives.

WHY PAKISTAN

by

BASHIR AHMAD DAR, M. A.

Author of

A Study in Iqbal's Philosophy

ERA PUBLICATIONS

LAHORE - INDIA

Rs. 3/12